

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, July 24, 1995
Volume 31—Number 29
Pages 1245–1285

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

American Legion Girls Nation—1280
Federal law enforcement officials—1278
National Archives and Records
Administration—1255
National Conference of State Legislatures—
1272
National Council of La Raza—1265
Portraits of President George Bush and
Barbara Bush, unveiling ceremony—1248
Radio address—1245

Communications to Congress

Arctic Research Plan, message transmitting
revision—1248
Defense Base Closure and Realignment
Commission, message transmitting report—
1245
Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and
Montenegro), message reporting—1250

Communications to Federal Agencies

Affirmative action, memorandum—1264

Executive Orders

Foreign Disaster Assistance—1247

Proclamations

Captive Nations Week—1250
Parents' Day—1282

Statements by the President

Budget rescission legislation—1282
Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban
Development appropriations legislation—
1255

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1285
Checklist of White House press releases—
1284
Digest of other White House
announcements—1283
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1283

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Week Ending Friday, July 21, 1995

**Message to the Congress
Transmitting the Report of the
Defense Base Closure and
Realignment Commission**

July 13, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the report containing the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission (BRAC) pursuant to section 2903 of Public Law 101-510, 104 Stat. 1810, as amended.

I hereby certify that I approve all the recommendations contained in the Commission's report.

In a July 8, 1995, letter to Deputy Secretary of Defense White (attached), Chairman Dixon confirmed that the Commission's recommendations permit the Department of Defense to privatize the work loads of the McClellan and Kelly facilities in place or elsewhere in their respective communities. The ability of the Defense Department to do this mitigates the economic impact on those communities, while helping the Air Force avoid the disruption in readiness that would result from relocation, as well as preserve the important defense work forces there.

As I transmit this report to the Congress, I want to emphasize that the Commission's agreement that the Secretary enjoys full authority and discretion to transfer work load from these two installations to the private sector, in place, locally or otherwise, is an integral part of the report. Should the Congress approve this package but then subsequently take action in other legislation to restrict privatization options at McClellan or Kelly, I would regard that action as a breach of Public Law 101-510 in the same manner as if the Congress were to attempt to reverse

by legislation any other material direction of this or any other BRAC.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
July 13, 1995.

NOTE: This message was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

July 15, 1995

Good morning. My job here is to make America work well for all of you who work hard. I ran for President to restore the American dream of opportunity for all, the American value of responsibility from all, and to bring the American people together as a community, not to permit us to continue to be divided and weakened. To do this we need a Government that empowers our people to make the most of their own lives but is smaller and less bureaucratic and less burdensome than it has been.

So we've got to cut regulations that impose unnecessary redtape or they just plain don't make sense. And we have to change the way regulators regulate, if that is abusive or it doesn't make sense. But as we cut, we have to remember that we have a responsibility to protect our citizens from things that threaten their safety and their health. Those are goals we all support, and we can accomplish them in a reasonable, responsible, bipartisan way.

Our administration is taking the lead. We've already reduced Government positions by 150,000, cut hundreds of Government programs, eliminated 16,000 pages of regulations. We've cut the Small Business Administration regulations by 50 percent, the Department of Education regulations by 40 percent, the time it takes to fill out the EPA regulations by 25 percent. We're changing

the way we enforce the regulations. We want less hassle. We want more compliance and less citations and fines. In other words, we've got to get out the worst problems of big Government and still keep protecting the public health and safety.

Right now, Republicans in the Congress are pushing a very different approach to regulation. I believe it poses a real danger to the health and safety of our families. They call it regulatory reform, but I don't think it's reform at all. It will force Government agencies to jump through all kinds of hoops, waste time, risk lives whenever the agency acts to protect people's health and safety. It will slow down, tangle up, and seriously hinder our ability to look out for the welfare of American families.

It will create just the kind of bureaucratic burdens that Republicans for years have said they hate. It will be more time for rule-making, more opportunities for special interests to stop the public interest, and many, many more lawsuits. I want a Government that's leaner and faster, that has a real partnership between the private sector and the Government. They want more bureaucracy, slower rulemaking, and a worsening of the adversarial relationship between Government and business, that shifts the burden and the balance of power.

If the Republican Congress' bill had become law years ago—listen to this—it would have taken longer than it did to get airbags in cars; schoolbuses might not have ever had to install those sideview mirrors that help drivers see children crossing in front. The longer we waited to do these things, the more lives it would have cost.

Now, let me tell you what the world would look like in the future under these extreme proposals. You've probably heard about the cryptosporidium bacteria that contaminated drinking water in Milwaukee. It made 400,000 people sick; it killed 100 Americans. It will be very difficult to prevent that kind of danger from finding its way into our water and to control it when it does if these rules take effect.

If the new system Congress proposes takes effect it will take much longer to impose new safety standards to prevent commuter airline crashes, like the five that happened last year.

We've proposed standards in that area, and they're being resisted. And it will be far less certain that we can use microscopes to examine meat and stop contaminated meat from being sold.

You may think that's amazing, but listen to this story. If we lived in a world like the one Congress is suggesting, there would be more tragedies like what happened to Eric Mueller. In 1993, Eric was a 13-year-old young man in California, the president of his class, the captain of his soccer team, an honor student. One day, like millions of other kids, he ordered a hamburger at a fast food restaurant. But he died a few days later because he was poisoned by an invisible bacteria, *E. coli*, that contaminated the hamburger. Dozens of others also died. And just last week, five more people in Tennessee, including an 11-year-old boy, got sick again because of *E. coli*.

How did this happen? Because the Federal Government has been inspecting meat the same old way since the turn of the century. Believe it or not, inspectors basically use the same methods to inspect meat that dogs use. They touch it and smell it to see if it's safe, instead of using microscopes and high technology.

That's crazy, and for the last 2 years we have been working hard to change that, to reform the meat inspection rules so that Americans can be confident they're protected. And believe it or not, while we're working to bring meat inspection into the 20th century, some special interests are trying to stop it, in spite of the fact that people have died from *E. coli*, and this Congress is willing to help them. We're trying to make our drinking water cleaner, but this Congress is willing to adopt a regulatory system that would let polluters delay and sometimes even control the rules that affect them.

In the last 6 months, we've seen these so-called regulatory reform bills actually being written by lobbyists for the regulated industries. The Congress even brought the lobbyists into the hearings to explain what the bills did. After all, they had to; the lobbyists had written the bills. I don't think that's right. I know it's not in the best interest of the American people, and it ought to be stopped.

No one has done more than our administration to streamline and reform a regulatory system. You'll never catch me defending a dumb regulation or an abusive Government regulator. The 16,000 pages of Federal regulations we have cut are enough to stretch 5 miles. We say to small business, if you have a problem and you fix it, you can forget the fine. I want to sign a real regulatory reform bill. And there is a good alternative sponsored by Senator Glenn and Senator Chafee. It provides a good starting point and—listen to this—it includes a 45-day waiting period in which Congress can review and reject any Government regulation that doesn't make sense. Now, isn't that a lot better than letting the interest groups actually delay these regulations forever, even though we need them for our health and safety?

I want Democrats and Republicans in Congress to show the American people that we can reform without rolling back. We can cut redtape, reduce paperwork, make life easier for business without endangering our families or our workers. We do have a responsibility to cut regulation, but we also have a responsibility to protect our families and our future. We can and must do both.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 3:24 p.m. on July 14 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on July 15.

Executive Order 12966—Foreign Disaster Assistance

July 14, 1995

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995, Public Law 103-337 (the "Act") and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. This order governs the implementation of section 404 of title 10, United States Code, as added by amendment set forth in section 1412(a) of the Act. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 404(a), the Secretary of Defense is hereby directed to provide disaster assistance outside the United States to respond to manmade or natural disasters when the

Secretary of Defense determines that such assistance is necessary to prevent loss of lives. The Secretary of Defense shall exercise the notification functions required of the President by 10 U.S.C. 404(c).

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Defense shall provide disaster assistance only: (a) at the direction of the President; or

(b) with the concurrence of the Secretary of State; or

(c) in emergency situations in order to save human lives, where there is not sufficient time to seek the prior initial concurrence of the Secretary of State, in which case the Secretary of Defense shall advise, and seek the concurrence of, the Secretary of State as soon as practicable thereafter.

For the purpose of section 2(b) of this order, only the Secretary of State, or the Deputy Secretary of State, or persons acting in those capacities, shall have the authority to withhold concurrence. Concurrence of the Secretary of State is not required for the execution of military operations undertaken pursuant to, and consistent with, assistance provided in accordance with parts (b) and (c) of this section, or with respect to matters relating to the internal financial processes of the Department of Defense.

Sec. 3. In providing assistance covered by this order, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, in the Administrator's capacity as the President's Special Coordinator for International Disaster Assistance.

Sec. 4. This order does not affect any activity or program authorized under any other provision of law, except that referred to in section 1 of this order.

Sec. 5. This order is effective at 12:01 a.m., e.d.t. on July 15, 1995.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
July 14, 1995.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:19 a.m., July 17, 1995]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 17, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on July 18.

**Message to the Congress
Transmitting the Revision to the
United States Arctic Research Plan**

July 14, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984, as amended (15 U.S.C. 4108(a)), I transmit herewith the fourth biennial revision (1996–2000) to the United States Arctic Research Plan.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
July 14, 1995.

**Remarks at the Unveiling Ceremony
for the Official Portraits of President
George Bush and Barbara Bush**

July 17, 1995

Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Breeden, for your kind remarks and for your essential work on behalf of the White House and the history of this country.

We're delighted to be here with President and Mrs. Bush today and Vice President and Mrs. Quayle, all the Members and former Members of Congress, the members of the Bush administration, and the friends of George and Barbara Bush and especially the family members. We welcome you all here to the White House.

It's impossible to live in this wonderful old place without becoming incredibly attached to it, to the history of our country and to what each and every one of these rooms represent. In a way, I think every family who has ever lived here has become more and more a part of our country's history, just for the privilege of sleeping under this roof at night. And so perhaps the most important thing I can say to President and Mrs. Bush today is, welcome home. We're glad to have you back.

I want to say, too, that we thought that we ought to have this ceremony in the East Room. This has always been the people's room. In the 19th century, it used to get so crowded at receptions that one of the windows over here was turned into a door so people could get out if they couldn't bear

the crowds anymore. There are so many here today, perhaps we should have done it again. But we thought the air-conditioning made it advisable for us to all stay put.

Many of you know that it was in this room that Abigail Adams used to dry the family laundry when the room was nothing more than a brick shell. You may not know that the great explorer Meriwether Lewis set up camp here, surrounded by canvas tarps, books, and hunting rifles in the day when he was Thomas Jefferson's secretary. John Quincy Adams frequently would come here to watch the Sun rise after he finished his early morning swim in the Potomac. That also is something we're considering taking up if the heat wave doesn't break.

The portraits that we add here today celebrate another chapter to our rich history and particularly to the rich history of the East Room where they will remain for a few days before they are properly hung. I managed to get a glimpse of these portraits, and I must admit that I think the artist did a wonderful job, and we're all in his debt. But I also want to say, President Bush, if I look half as good as you do when I leave office, I'll be a happy man. *[Laughter]*

I want to again compliment Herbert Abrams, the artist. He also painted the portrait of President Carter. So once again, President Bush has set another outstanding example of bipartisanship.

These portraits, as has already been said, will be seen by millions of Americans who visit here, reminding them of what these two great Americans stood for and for what they have done to strengthen our country. The portraits in the White House are more than likenesses. They tell the story of the promise of one American life and, in so doing, the promise of all American life. They offer a lesson, an example, a challenge for every American to live up to the responsibilities of citizenship.

As Americans look for ways to come together to deal with the challenges we face today, they can do well in looking at the lives of President and Mrs. Bush. They have been guided by the basic American values and virtues of honesty, compassion, civility, responsibility, and optimism. They have passed these values on to their family and on to our

American family as well. And for that we should all be profoundly grateful.

Mrs. Bush's portrait will hang adjacent to the Vermeil Room on the ground floor corridor, taking her place in history in the line of America's First Ladies. One role of the First Lady is to open the doors to the White House. Mrs. Bush will be in the hearts of Americans forever for the gracious way in which she opened so many doors, not just to this house but to a world of endless possibility through reading. Her campaign for literacy exemplified our country's great spirit of voluntarism and our primary concern for the potential of every individual American. Her life of helping others has brought recognition to all those Americans, especially to American women, who have seen unmet needs in their communities and reached out to meet them. We cannot thank her enough.

President Bush's portrait will hang out here in the Grand Foyer, across from the portrait of President Franklin Roosevelt, the Commander in Chief he served in World War II. It will stand as a reminder of George Bush's basic integrity and decency and of his entire adult lifetime devoted to public service. Most of all, it will stand as a testimony to a leader who helped Americans move forward toward common ground on many fronts. We see this clearly in the causes George Bush led us in as President, causes that aimed at improving the lives not just of Republicans but of all Americans.

He made education a national priority when he hosted the education summit in 1989, something I will never forget and always be especially personally grateful for, because he understood that a solid education is essential to every American's ability to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

He led us to a new dedication to service and extolled the real heroes in America, the ordinary Americans who every day go about solving the problems of this country in courageous, brave, and quiet manners. The Points of Light Initiative held up the best in America, reminded us of what we can do when we truly work together. And I can say that it was the one thing he did that he personally asked me to continue when I took this office, and I was honored to do it because it was

so important. And it remains important to the United States today.

He signed the Americans with Disabilities Act, something that has now acquired broad support among people of all parties and all walks of life and which has made a real difference to the quality of life of Americans who are now making larger contributions to the rest of us. And he supported and signed the Clean Air Act, which is terribly important today in preserving the quality of American life.

He also led our Nation and the world in the Gulf War alliance, in an example of contributions and cooperations in the aftermath of the cold war that I believe will long be followed.

Finally, since he has left this office, he has continued to be an active and aggressive citizen for what he believed in. He worked here to help us to pass NAFTA, something for which I am profoundly grateful. And just the other day, he earned the gratitude of all Americans who believe in law and order and believe in civil citizenship when he defended the honor and reputation of law-abiding law enforcement officers and Government employees. For all these things, all Americans should be grateful to George Bush.

For President and Mrs. Bush, love of country and service to it have always meant the same thing. We honor them both today for their leadership, their character, and their concern for their fellow citizens.

On November 2, 1800, the day after his very first night in the White House, John Adams wrote to his wife, "I pray Heaven to bestow the best of blessings on this house and on all that shall hereafter inhabit it. May none but honest and wise men ever rule under this roof." In the case of George Bush, John Adams' prayers were surely met.

It is my great honor and pleasure now to unveil the official portraits of President and Mrs. Bush.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:19 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Robert L. Breeden, chairman of the board, White House Historical Association.

Proclamation 6810—Captive Nations Week, 1995

July 17, 1995

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

As we mark the 36th observance of "Captive Nations Week," Americans reflect on the sorrow of peoples throughout the world who are physically and spiritually oppressed by their governments. In our hearts, we know that the ongoing struggle for individual liberty is part of a larger cause—an international quest for true peace. Recent years have seen great progress in the global march toward freedom. But far too many of humanity's children still live in fear.

Our commemoration of this week reflects the concern of Americans for all of those in need. Having sustained the promise of democracy for more than 200 years, we understand its many blessings and its profound importance in the world. While we celebrate the triumph of democratic governments in nations around the globe, we stay bound to those who remain prisoners of violence, poverty, and prejudice. As beneficiaries of freedom's power, we must champion their struggle, promoting respect for human dignity everywhere on Earth.

Stripped of fundamental personal rights and barred from realizing their political voice, the captive citizens of authoritarian regimes share our people's dreams of happiness. Today, in nations of the former Soviet bloc and from Asia to Africa to Latin America, our new democratic friends are acting on their hopes for opportunity and prosperity, recognizing that respect for individual freedom is the key to internal and international stability. America plays a vital role in this process of growth and change. As President John F. Kennedy said years ago, our "historic task in this embattled age is not merely to defend freedom. It is to extend its writ and strengthen its covenant." We Americans have an enormous stake in the fate of captive nations. Their future is no less than our greatest hope for peace.

The Congress, by Joint Resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), has au-

thorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July of each year as "Captive Nations Week."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim July 16 through July 22, 1995, as Captive Nations Week. I call upon the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, rededicating ourselves to the principles of freedom and justice on which this Nation was founded and by which it will ever endure.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this seventeenth day of July, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twentieth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:43 p.m., July 17, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on July 19.

Message to the Congress on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)

July 18, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

On May 30, 1992, in Executive Order No. 12808, the President declared a national emergency to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States arising from actions and policies of the Governments of Serbia and Montenegro, acting under the name of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, in their involvement in and support for groups attempting to seize territory in Croatia and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina by force and violence utilizing, in part, the forces of the so-called Yugoslav National Army (57 FR 23299, June 2, 1992). I expanded the national emergency in Executive Order No. 12934 of October 25, 1994, to address the actions and policies of the Bosnian Serb forces and the authorities in the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina that they control.

The present report is submitted pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) and 1703(c). It discusses Administration actions and expenses directly related to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency in Executive Order No. 12808 and Executive Order No. 12934 and to expanded sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) (the "FRY (S/M)") and the Bosnian Serbs contained in Executive Order No. 12810 of June 5, 1992 (57 *FR* 24347, June 9, 1992), Executive Order No. 12831 of January 15, 1993 (58 *FR* 5253, Jan. 21, 1993), Executive Order No. 12846 of April 25, 1993 (58 *FR* 25771, April 27, 1993), and Executive Order No. 12934 of October 25, 1994 (59 *FR* 54117, October 27, 1994).

1. Executive Order No. 12808 blocked all property and interests in property of the Governments of Serbia and Montenegro, or held in the name of the former Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, then or thereafter located in the United States or within the possession or control of U.S. persons, including their overseas branches.

Subsequently, Executive Order No. 12810 expanded U.S. actions to implement in the United States the United Nations sanctions against the FRY (S/M) adopted in United Nations Security Council ("UNSC") Resolution 757 of May 30, 1992. In addition to reaffirming the blocking of FRY (S/M) Government property, this order prohibited transactions with respect to the FRY (S/M) involving imports, exports, dealing in FRY-origin property, air and sea transportation, contract performance, funds transfers, activity promoting importation or exportation or dealings in property, and official sports, scientific, technical, or other cultural representation of, or sponsorship by, the FRY (S/M) in the United States.

Executive Order No. 12810 exempted from trade restrictions (1) transshipments through the FRY (S/M), and (2) activities related to the United Nations Protection Force ("UNPROFOR"), the Conference on Yugoslavia, or the European Community Monitor Mission.

On January 15, 1993, President Bush issued Executive Order No. 12831 to implement new sanctions contained in U.N. Security Council Resolution 787 of November 16, 1992. The order revoked the exemption for transshipments through the FRY (S/M) contained in Executive Order No. 12810, prohibited transactions within the United States or by a U.S. person relating to FRY (S/M) vessels and vessels in which a majority or controlling interest is held by a person or entity in, or operating from, the FRY (S/M), and stated that all such vessels shall be considered as vessels of the FRY (S/M), regardless of the flag under which they sail.

On April 25, 1993, I issued Executive Order No. 12846 to implement in the United States the sanctions adopted in UNSC Resolution 820 of April 17, 1993. That resolution called on the Bosnian Serbs to accept the Vance-Owen peace plan for the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and, if they failed to do so by April 26, called on member states to take additional measures to tighten the embargo against the FRY (S/M) and Serbian controlled areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the United Nations Protected Areas in Croatia. Effective April 26, 1993, the order blocked all property and interests in property of commercial, industrial, or public utility undertakings or entities organized or located in the FRY (S/M), including property and interests in property of entities (wherever organized or located) owned or controlled by such undertakings or entities, that are or thereafter come within the possession or control of U.S. persons.

On October 25, 1994, in view of UNSC Resolution 942 of September 23, 1994, I issued Executive Order No. 12934 in order to take additional steps with respect to the crisis in the former Yugoslavia. (59 *FR* 54117, October 27, 1994.) Executive Order No. 12934 expands the scope of the national emergency declared in Executive Order No. 12808 to address the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States posed by the actions and policies of the Bosnian Serb forces and the authorities in the territory in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina that they control, including their refusal to accept the proposed territorial settlement of the

conflict in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Executive order blocks all property and interests in property that are in the United States, that hereafter come within the United States, or that are or hereafter come within the possession or control of United States persons (including their overseas branches) of: (1) the Bosnian Serb military and paramilitary forces and the authorities in areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the control of those forces; (2) any entity, including any commercial, industrial, or public utility undertaking, organized or located in those areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the control of Bosnian Serb forces; (3) any entity, wherever organized or located, which is owned or controlled directly or indirectly by any person in, or resident in, those areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the control of Bosnian Serb forces; and (4) any person acting for or on behalf of any person within the scope of the above definitions.

The Executive order also prohibits the provision or exportation of services to those areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the control of Bosnian Serb forces, or to any person for the purpose of any business carried on in those areas, either from the United States or by a U.S. person. The order also prohibits the entry of any U.S.-flagged vessel, other than a U.S. naval vessel, into the riverine ports of those areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the control of Bosnia Serb forces. Finally, any transaction by any U.S. person that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate any of the prohibitions set forth in the order is prohibited. Executive Order No. 12934 became effective at 11:59 p.m., e.d.t., on October 25, 1994.

2. The declaration of the national emergency on May 30, 1992, was made pursuant to the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), and section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code. The emergency

declaration was reported to the Congress on May 30, 1992, pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) and the expansion of that National Emergency under the same authorities was reported to the Congress on October 25, 1994. The additional sanctions set forth in related Executive orders were imposed pursuant to the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the statutes cited above, section 1114 of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C. App. 1514), and section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act (22 U.S.C. 287c).

3. There have been no amendments to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) Sanctions Regulations (the "Regulations"), 31 C.F.R. Part 585, since the last report. The Treasury Department had previously published 853 names in the Federal Register on November 17, 1994 (59 *FR* 59460), as part of a comprehensive listing of all blocked persons and specially designated nationals ("SDNs") of the FRY (S/M). This list identified individuals and entities determined by the Department of the Treasury to be owned or controlled by or acting for or on behalf of the Government of the FRY (S/M), persons in the FRY (S/M), or entities located or organized in or controlled from the FRY (S/M). All prohibitions in the Regulations pertaining to the Government of the FRY (S/M) apply to the entities and individuals identified. U.S. persons, on notice of the status of such blocked persons and specially designated nationals, are prohibited from entering into transactions with them, or transactions in which they have an interest, unless otherwise exempted or authorized pursuant to the Regulations.

On February 22, 1995, pursuant to Executive Order 12934 and the Regulations, Treasury identified 85 individuals as leaders of the Bosnian Serb forces or civilian authorities in the territories in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina that they control. Also on February 22, Treasury designated 19 individuals and 23 companies as SDNs of the FRY (S/M). These designations include FRY (S/M)-connected companies around the world that are being directed from Cyprus, two Cypriot-owned firms that have had a central role in

helping establish and sustain sanctions-evading FRY (S/M) front companies in Cyprus, and the head of the FRY (S/M)'s Central Bank who is also the architect of the FRY (S/M) economic program.

Additionally, on March 13, 1995, Treasury named 32 firms and eight individuals that are part of the Karic Brothers' family network of companies as SDNs of the FRY (S/M). Their enterprises span the globe and are especially active in former East Bloc countries. These additions and amendments, published in the Federal Register on April 18, 1995 (60 FR 19448), bring the current total of Blocked Entities and SDNs of the FRY (S/M) to 938 and the total number of individuals identified as leaders of the Bosnian Serb military or paramilitary forces or civilian authorities in the territories in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina that they control to 85. A copy of the notice is attached.

Treasury's blocking authority as applied to FRY (S/M) subsidiaries and vessels in the United States has been challenged in court. In *Milena Ship Management Company, Ltd. v. Newcomb*, 804 F.Supp. 846, 855, and 859 (E.D.L.A. 1992) *aff'd*, 995 F.2d 620 (5th Cir. 1993), *cert. denied*, 114 S.Ct. 877 (1994), involving five ships owned or controlled by FRY (S/M) entities blocked in various U.S. ports, the blocking authority as applied to these vessels was upheld. In *IPT Company, Inc. v. United States Department of the Treasury*, No. 92 CIV 5542 (S.D.N.Y. 1994), the district court also upheld the blocking authority as applied to the property of a Yugoslav subsidiary located in the United States. The latter case is currently on appeal to the Second Circuit.

4. Over the past 6 months, the Departments of State and Treasury have worked closely with European Union (the "EU") member states and other U.N. member nations to coordinate implementation of the U.N. sanctions against the FRY (S/M). This has included visits by assessment teams formed under the auspices of the United States, the EU, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (the "OSCE") to states bordering on Serbia and Montenegro; continued deployment of OSCE sanctions assistance missions ("SAMs") to Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, the

former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Hungary, Romania, and Ukraine to assist in monitoring land and Danube River traffic; support for the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia ("ICFY") monitoring missions along the Serbia-Montenegro-Bosnia border; bilateral contacts between the United States and other countries for the purpose of tightening financial and trade restrictions on the FRY (S/M); and ongoing multilateral meetings by financial sanctions enforcement authorities from various countries to coordinate enforcement efforts and to exchange technical information.

5. In accordance with licensing policy and the Regulations, FAC has exercised its authority to license certain specific transactions with respect to the FRY (S/M) that are consistent with U.S. foreign policy and the Security Council sanctions. During the reporting period, FAC has issued 109 specific licenses regarding transactions pertaining to the FRY (S/M) or assets it owns or controls, bringing the total as of April 25, 1995, to 930. Specific licenses have been issued (1) for payment to U.S. or third-country secured creditors, under certain narrowly-defined circumstances, for pre-embargo import and export transactions; (2) for legal representation or advice to the Government of the FRY (S/M) or FRY (S/M)-located or controlled entities; (3) for the liquidation or protection of tangible assets of subsidiaries of FRY (S/M)-located or controlled firms located in the U.S.; (4) for limited transactions related to FRY (S/M) diplomatic representation in Washington and New York; (5) for patent, trademark and copyright protection in the FRY (S/M) not involving payment to the FRY (S/M) Government; (6) for certain communications, news media, and travel-related transactions; (7) for the payment of crews' wages, vessel maintenance, and emergency supplies for FRY (S/M) controlled ships blocked in the United States; (8) for the removal from the FRY (S/M), or protection within the FRY (S/M), of certain property owned and controlled by U.S. entities; (9) to assist the United Nations in its relief operations and the activities of the U.N. Protection Force; and (10) for payment from funds outside the United States where a third country has licensed the transaction in accordance

with U.N. sanctions. Pursuant to U.S. regulations implementing UNSC Resolutions, specific licenses have also been issued to authorize exportation of food, medicine, and supplies intended for humanitarian purposes in the FRY (S/M).

During the past 6 months, FAC has continued to oversee the liquidation of tangible assets of the 15 U.S. subsidiaries of entities organized in the FRY (S/M). Subsequent to the issuance of Executive Order No. 12846, all operating licenses issued for these U.S.-located Serbian or Montenegrin subsidiaries or joint ventures were revoked, and the net proceeds of the liquidation of their assets placed in blocked accounts.

In order to reduce the drain on blocked assets caused by continuing to rent commercial space, FAC arranged to have the blocked personalty, files, and records of the two Serbian banking institutions in New York moved to secure storage. The personalty is being liquidated, with the net proceeds placed in blocked accounts.

Following the sale of the M/V Kapetan Martinovic in January 1995, five Yugoslav-owned vessels remain blocked in the United States. Approval of the UNSC's Serbian Sanctions Committee was sought and obtained for the sale of the M/V Kapetan Martinovic (and the M/V Bor, which was sold in June 1994) based on U.S. assurances that the sale would comply with four basic conditions, which assure that both U.S. and U.N. sanctions objectives with respect to the FRY (S/M) are met: (1) the sale will be for fair market value; (2) the sale will result in a complete divestiture of any interest of the FRY (S/M) (or of commercial interests located in or controlled from the FRY (S/M)) in the vessel; (3) the sale would result in no economic benefit to the FRY (S/M) (or commercial interests located in or controlled from the FRY (S/M)); and (4) the net proceeds of the sale (the gross proceeds less the costs of sale normally paid by the seller) will be placed in a blocked account in the United States. Negotiations for the sale of the M/V Bar, now blocked in New Orleans, are underway and are likely to be concluded prior to my next report.

Other than the M/V Bar, the four remaining Yugoslav-owned vessels are beneficially owned by Jugooceanija Plovidba of Kotor,

Montenegro, and managed by Milena Ship Management Co. Ltd. in Malta. These vessels have many unpaid U.S. creditors for services and supplies furnished during the time they have been blocked in the United States; moreover, the owner appears to have insufficient resources to provide for the future upkeep and maintenance needs of these vessels and their crews. The United States is notifying the UNSC's Serbian Sanctions Committee of the United States's intention to license some or all of these remaining four vessels upon the owner's request.

With the FAC-licensed sales of the M/V Kapetan Martinovic and the M/V Bor, those vessels were removed from the list of blocked FRY entities and merchant vessels maintained by FAC. The new owners of several formerly Yugoslav-owned vessels, which have been sold in other countries, have petitioned FAC to remove those vessels from the list. FAC, in coordination with the Department of State, is currently reviewing the sale terms and conditions for those vessels to ascertain whether they comply with U.N. sanctions objectives and UNSC's Serbian Sanctions Committee practice.

During the past 6 months, U.S. financial institutions have continued to block funds transfers in which there is an interest of the Government of the FRY (S/M) or an entity or undertaking located in or controlled from the FRY (S/M), and to stop prohibited transfers to persons in the FRY (S/M). Such interdicted transfers have accounted for \$125.6 million since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12808, including some \$9.3 million during the past 6 months.

To ensure compliance with the terms of the licenses that have been issued under the program, stringent reporting requirements are imposed. More than 279 submissions have been reviewed by FAC since the last report, and more than 125 compliance cases are currently open.

6. Since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12810, FAC has worked closely with the U.S. Customs Service to ensure both that prohibited imports and exports (including those in which the Government of the FRY (S/M) or Bosnian Serb authorities have an interest) are identified and interdicted, and that permitted imports and exports move to

their intended destination without undue delay. Violations and suspected violations of the embargo are being investigated and appropriate enforcement actions are being taken. There are currently 37 cases under active investigation. Since the last report, FAC has collected nine civil penalties totaling nearly \$20,000. Of these, five were paid by U.S. financial institutions for violative funds transfers involving the Government of the FRY (S/M), persons in the FRY (S/M), or entities located or organized in or controlled from the FRY (S/M). Three U.S. companies and one air carrier have also paid penalties related to exports or unlicensed payments to the Government of the FRY (S/M) or persons in the FRY (S/M) or other violations of the Regulations.

7. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from November 30, 1994, through May 29, 1995, that are directly attributable to the authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to the FRY (S/M) and the Bosnian Serb forces and authorities are estimated at about \$3.5 million, most of which represent wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in FAC and its Chief Counsel's Office, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of State, the National Security Council, the U.S. Coast Guard, and the Department of Commerce.

8. The actions and policies of the Government of the FRY (S/M), in its involvement in and support for groups attempting to seize and hold territory in the Republics of Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina by force and violence, and the actions and policies of the Bosnian Serb forces and the authorities in the areas of Bosnia and Herzegovina under their control, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. The United States remains committed to a multilateral resolution of the conflict through implementation of the United Nations Security Council resolutions.

I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against the FRY (S/M) and the Bosnian Serb forces, civil authorities, and entities, as long

as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

William J. Clinton

The White House,
July 18, 1995.

Statement on Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Legislation

July 18, 1995

The 1996 VA-HUD appropriations bill passed today by the House Appropriations Committee is unacceptable.

By abolishing AmeriCorps it would eliminate opportunities for thousands of young people to serve their communities through the national service program. By dramatically slashing resources for the Environmental Protection Agency and imposing severe restrictions on that agency, the bill would decimate the Government's ability to protect the American people from air and water pollution. By cutting assistance for the Nation's homeless in half, it would punish some of the weakest and most vulnerable in our society.

We need to balance the budget, and we need to cut spending to do it. But there is a right way and a wrong way. A bill so contrary to the priorities and concerns of the American people clearly represents the wrong way.

I will not stand by as the Republican majority tries to impose this extreme agenda on the Nation. If this bill is presented to me in its current form, I will veto it. I call on the Congress to correct the appropriations bills now under consideration before they reach my desk, not after.

Remarks at the National Archives and Records Administration

July 19, 1995

Thank you very much. To the Members of Congress who are here, members of the Cabinet and the administration, my fellow Americans: In recent weeks I have begun a

conversation with the American people about our fate and our duty to prepare our Nation not only to meet the new century but to live and lead in a world transformed to a degree seldom seen in all of our history. Much of this change is good, but it is not all good, and all of us are affected by it. Therefore, we must reach beyond our fears and our divisions to a new time of great and common purpose.

Our challenge is twofold: first, to restore the American dream of opportunity and the American value of responsibility; and second, to bring our country together amid all our diversity into a stronger community, so that we can find common ground and move forward as one.

More than ever these two endeavors are inseparable. I am absolutely convinced we cannot restore economic opportunity or solve our social problems unless we find a way to bring the American people together. To bring our people together we must openly and honestly deal with the issues that divide us. Today I want to discuss one of those issues, affirmative action.

It is, in a way, ironic that this issue should be divisive today, because affirmative action began 25 years ago by a Republican President with bipartisan support. It began simply as a means to an end of enduring national purpose, equal opportunity for all Americans.

So let us today trace the roots of affirmative action in our never-ending search for equal opportunity. Let us determine what it is and what it isn't. Let us see where it's worked and where it hasn't and ask ourselves what we need to do now. Along the way, let us remember always that finding common ground as we move toward the 21st century depends fundamentally on our shared commitment to equal opportunity for all Americans. It is a moral imperative, a constitutional mandate, and a legal necessity.

There could be no better place for this discussion than the National Archives, for within these walls are America's bedrocks of our common ground, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights. No paper is as lasting as the words these documents contain, so we put them in these special cases to protect the parchment from the elements. No building is as solid

as the principles these documents embody, but we sure tried to build one with these metal doors 11 inches thick to keep them safe, for these documents are America's only crown jewels. But the best place of all to hold these words and these principles is the one place in which they can never fade and never grow old, in the stronger chambers of our hearts.

Beyond all else, our country is a set of convictions: We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Our whole history can be seen first as an effort to preserve these rights and then as an effort to make them real in the lives of all our citizens.

We know that from the beginning there was a great gap between the plain meaning of our creed and the meaner reality of our daily lives. Back then, only white male property owners could vote. Black slaves were not even counted as whole people, and Native Americans were regarded as little more than an obstacle to our great national progress. No wonder Thomas Jefferson, reflecting on slavery, said he trembled to think God is just.

On the 200th anniversary of our great Constitution, Justice Thurgood Marshall, the grandson of a slave, said, "The Government our Founders devised was defective from the start, requiring several amendments, a civil war, and momentous social transformation to attain the system of constitutional government and its respect for the individual freedoms and human rights we hold as fundamental today."

Emancipation, women's suffrage, civil rights, voting rights, equal rights, the struggle for the rights of the disabled, all these and other struggles are milestones on America's often rocky but fundamentally righteous journey to close the gap between the ideals enshrined in these treasures here in the National Archives and the reality of our daily lives.

I first came to this very spot where I'm standing today 32 years ago this month. I was a 16-year-old delegate to the American Legion Boys Nation. Now, that summer was a high-water mark for our national journey.

That was the summer that President Kennedy ordered Alabama National Guardsmen to enforce a court order to allow two young blacks to enter the University of Alabama. As he told our Nation, "Every American ought to have the right to be treated as he would wish to be treated, as one would wish his children to be treated."

Later that same summer, on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, Martin Luther King told Americans of his dream that one day the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slaveowners would sit down together at the table of brotherhood, that one day his four little children would be judged not by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. His words captured the hearts and steeled the wills of millions of Americans. Some of them sang with him in the hot sun that day. Millions more like me listened and wept in the privacy of their homes.

It's hard to believe where we were just three decades ago. When I came up here to Boys Nation and we had this mock congressional session, I was one of only three or four southerners who would even vote for the civil rights plank. That's largely because of my family. My grandfather had a grade school education and ran a grocery store across the street from the cemetery in Hope, Arkansas, where my parents and my grandparents are buried. Most of his customers were black, were poor, and were working people. As a child in that store, I saw that people of different races could treat each other with respect and dignity. But I also saw that the black neighborhood across the street was the only one in town where the streets weren't paved. And when I returned to that neighborhood in the late sixties to see a woman who had cared for me as a toddler, the streets still weren't paved. A lot of you know that I am an ardent movie-goer. As a child, I never went to a movie where I could sit next to a black American. They were always sitting upstairs.

In the 1960's, believe it or not, there were still a few courthouse squares in my State where the restrooms were marked "white" and "colored." I graduated from a segregated high school 7 years after President Eisenhower integrated Little Rock Central High

School. And when President Kennedy barely carried my home State in 1960, the poll tax system was still alive and well there.

Even though my grandparents were in a minority, being poor Southern whites who were pro-civil rights, I think most other people knew better than to think the way they did. And those who were smart enough to act differently discovered a lesson that we ought to remember today: Discrimination is not just morally wrong, it hurts everybody.

In 1960, Atlanta, Georgia, in reaction to all the things that were going on all across the South, adopted the motto, "the city too busy to hate." And however imperfectly over the years, they tried to live by it. I am convinced that Atlanta's success—it now is home to more foreign corporations than any other American city, and one year from today it will begin to host the Olympics—that that success all began when people got too busy to hate.

The lesson we learned was a hard one. When we allow people to pit us against one another or spend energy denying opportunity based on our differences, everyone is held back. But when we give all Americans a chance to develop and use their talents, to be full partners in our common enterprise, then everybody is pushed forward.

My experiences with discrimination are rooted in the South and in the legacy slavery left. I also lived with a working mother and a working grandmother when women's work was far rarer and far more circumscribed than it is today. But we all know there are millions of other stories, those of Hispanics, Asian-Americans, Native Americans, people with disabilities, others against whom fingers have been pointed. Many of you have your own stories, and that's why you're here today, people who were denied the right to develop and to use their full human potential. And their progress, too, is a part of our journey to make the reality of America consistent with the principles just behind me here.

Thirty years ago in this city, you didn't see many people of color or women making their way to work in the morning in business clothes or serving in substantial numbers in powerful positions in Congress or at the White House or making executive decisions every day in businesses. In fact, even the em-

ployment want ads were divided, men on one side and women on the other. It was extraordinary then to see women or people of color as television news anchors or, believe it or not, even in college sports. There were far fewer women and minorities as job supervisors or firefighters or police officers or doctors or lawyers or college professors or in many other jobs that offer stability and honor and integrity to family life.

A lot has changed, and it did not happen as some sort of random evolutionary drift. It took hard work and sacrifices and countless acts of courage and conscience by millions of Americans. It took the political courage and statesmanship of Democrats and Republicans alike, the vigilance and compassion of courts and advocates in and out of Government committed to the Constitution and to equal protection and to equal opportunity. It took the leadership of people in business who knew that in the end we would all be better. It took the leadership of people in labor unions who knew that working people had to be reconciled.

Some people, like Congressman Lewis there, put their lives on the line. Other people lost their lives. And millions of Americans changed their own lives and put hate behind them. As a result, today all our lives are better. Women have become a major force in business and political life and far more able to contribute to their families' incomes. A true and growing black middle class has emerged. Higher education has literally been revolutionized, with women and racial and ethnic minorities attending once overwhelmingly white and sometimes all-male schools. In communities across our Nation, police departments now better reflect the makeup of those whom they protect. A generation of professionals now serve as role models for young women and minority youth. Hispanics and newer immigrant populations are succeeding in making America stronger.

For an example of where the best of our future lies, just think about our space program and the stunning hookup with the Russian space station this month. Let's remember that that program, the world's finest, began with heroes like Alan Shepard and Senator John Glenn, but today it's had American heroes like Sally Ride, Ellen Ochoa,

Leroy Chiao, Guy Bluford, and other outstanding, completely qualified women and minorities.

How did this happen? Fundamentally, because we opened our hearts and minds and changed our ways. But not without pressure, the pressure of court decisions, legislation, executive action, and the power of examples in the public and private sector. Along the way we learned that laws alone do not change society, that old habits and thinking patterns are deeply ingrained and die hard, that more is required to really open the doors of opportunity. Our search to find ways to move more quickly to equal opportunity led to the development of what we now call affirmative action.

The purpose of affirmative action is to give our Nation a way to finally address the systemic exclusion of individuals of talent on the basis of their gender or race from opportunities to develop, perform, achieve, and contribute. Affirmative action is an effort to develop a systematic approach to open the doors of education, employment, and business development opportunities to qualified individuals who happen to be members of groups that have experienced longstanding and persistent discrimination.

It is a policy that grew out of many years of trying to navigate between two unacceptable pasts. One was to say simply that we declared discrimination illegal and that's enough. We saw that that way still relegated blacks with college degrees to jobs as railroad porters and kept women with degrees under a glass ceiling with a lower paycheck.

The other path was simply to try to impose change by leveling draconian penalties on employers who didn't meet certain imposed, ultimately arbitrary, and sometimes unachievable quotas. That, too, was rejected out of a sense of fairness.

So a middle ground was developed that would change an inequitable status quo gradually but firmly, by building the pool of qualified applicants for college, for contracts, for jobs, and giving more people the chance to learn, work, and earn. When affirmative action is done right, it is flexible, it is fair, and it works.

I know some people are honestly concerned about the times affirmative action

doesn't work, when it's done in the wrong way. And I know there are times when some employers don't use it in the right way. They may cut corners and treat a flexible goal as a quota. They may give opportunities to people who are unqualified instead of those who deserve it. They may, in so doing, allow a different kind of discrimination. When this happens, it is also wrong. But it isn't affirmative action, and it is not legal.

So when our administration finds cases of that sort, we will enforce the law aggressively. The Justice Department files hundreds of cases every year attacking discrimination in employment, including suits on behalf of white males. Most of these suits, however, affect women and minorities for a simple reason, because the vast majority of discrimination in America is still discrimination against them. But the law does require fairness for everyone, and we are determined to see that that is exactly what the law delivers.

Let me be clear about what affirmative action must not mean and what I won't allow it to be. It does not mean and I don't favor the unjustified preference of the unqualified over the qualified of any race or gender. It doesn't mean and I don't favor numerical quotas. It doesn't mean and I don't favor rejection or selection of any employee or student solely on the basis of race or gender without regard to merit.

Like many business executives and public servants, I owe it to you to say that my views on this subject are, more than anything else, the product of my personal experience. I have had experience with affirmative action, nearly 20 years of it now, and I know it works.

When I was attorney general of my home State, I hired a record number of women and African-American lawyers, every one clearly qualified and exceptionally hard-working. As Governor, I appointed more women to my Cabinet and State boards than any other Governor in the State's history, and more African-Americans than all the Governors in the State's history combined. And no one ever questioned their qualifications or performance, and our State was better and stronger because of their service.

As President, I am proud to have the most diverse administration in history in my Cabinet, my agencies, and my staff. And I must

say, I have been surprised at the criticism I have received from some quarters in my determination to achieve this.

In the last 2½ years, the most outstanding example of affirmative action in the United States, the Pentagon, has opened 260,000 positions for women who serve in our Armed Forces. I have appointed more women and minorities to the Federal bench than any other President, more than the last two combined. And yet, far more of our judicial appointments have received the highest rating from the American Bar Association than any other administration since those ratings have been given.

In our administration many Government agencies are doing more business with qualified firms run by minorities and women. The Small Business Administration has reduced its budget by 40 percent, doubled its loan outputs, dramatically increased the number of loans to women and minority small business people, without reducing the number of loans to white businessowners who happen to be male and without changing the loan standards for a single, solitary application. Quality and diversity can go hand-in-hand, and they must.

Let me say that affirmative action has also done more than just open the doors of opportunity to individual Americans. Most economists who study it agree that affirmative action has also been an important part of closing gaps in economic opportunity in our society, thereby strengthening the entire economy.

A group of distinguished business leaders told me just a couple of days ago that their companies are stronger and their profits are larger because of the diversity and the excellence of their work forces achieved through intelligent and fair affirmative action programs. And they said, "We have gone far beyond anything the Government might require us to do because managing diversity and individual opportunity and being fair to everybody is the key to our future economic success in the global marketplace."

Now, there are those who say, my fellow Americans, that even good affirmative action programs are no longer needed, that it should be enough to resort to the courts or the Equal Employment Opportunity Com-

mission in cases of actual, provable, individual discrimination because there is no longer any systematic discrimination in our society. In deciding how to answer that, let us consider the facts.

The unemployment rate for African-Americans remains about twice that of whites. The Hispanic rate is still much higher. Women have narrowed the earnings gap, but still make only 72 percent as much as men do for comparable jobs. The average income for an Hispanic woman with a college degree is still less than the average income of a white man with a high school diploma.

According to the recently completed glass ceiling report, sponsored by Republican Members of Congress, in the Nation's largest companies only six-tenths of one percent of senior management positions are held by African-Americans, four-tenths of a percent by Hispanic-Americans, three-tenths of a percent by Asian-Americans; women hold between 3 and 5 percent of these positions. White males make up 43 percent of our work force but hold 95 percent of these jobs.

Just last week, the Chicago Federal Reserve Bank reported that black home loan applicants are more than twice as likely to be denied credit as whites with the same qualifications and that Hispanic applicants are more than 1½ times as likely to be denied loans as whites with the same qualifications.

Last year alone the Federal Government received more than 90,000 complaints of employment discrimination based on race, ethnicity, or gender; less than 3 percent were for reverse discrimination.

Evidence abounds in other ways of the persistence of the kind of bigotry that can affect the way we think, even if we're not conscious of it, in hiring and promotion and business and educational decisions.

Crimes and violence based on hate against Asians, Hispanics, African-Americans, and other minorities are still with us. And I'm sorry to say that the worst and most recent evidence of this involves a recent report of Federal law enforcement officials in Tennessee attending an event literally overflowing with racism, a sickening reminder of just how pervasive these kinds of attitudes still are.

By the way, I want to tell you that I am committed to finding the truth about what happened there and to taking appropriate action. And I want to say that if anybody who works in Federal law enforcement thinks that that kind of behavior is acceptable, they ought to think about working someplace else.

Now, let's get to the other side of the argument. If affirmative action has worked and if there is evidence that discrimination still exists on a wide scale in ways that are conscious and unconscious, then why should we get rid of it as many people are urging? Some question the effectiveness or the fairness of particular affirmative action programs. I say to all of you, those are fair questions, and they prompted the review of our affirmative action programs about which I will talk in a few moments.

Some question the fundamental purpose of the effort. There are people who honestly believe that affirmative action always amounts to group preferences over individual merit, that affirmative action always leads to reverse discrimination, that ultimately, therefore, it demeans those who benefit from it and discriminates against those who are not helped by it.

I just have to tell you that all of you have to decide how you feel about that, and all of our fellow country men and women have to decide as well. But I believe if there are no quotas, if we give no opportunities to unqualified people, if we have no reverse discrimination, and if, when the problem ends, the program ends, that criticism is wrong. That's what I believe. But we should have this debate, and everyone should ask the question.

Now let's deal with what I really think is behind so much of this debate today. There are a lot of people who oppose affirmative action today who supported it for a very long time. I believe they are responding to the sea change in the experiences that most Americans have in the world in which we live. If you say now you're against affirmative action because the Government is using its power or the private sector is using its power to help minorities at the expense of the majority, that gives you a way of explaining away the economic distress that a majority of Americans honestly feel. It gives you a way

of turning their resentment against the minorities or against a particular Government program, instead of having an honest debate about how we all got into the fix we're in and what we're all going to do together to get out of it.

That explanation, the affirmative action explanation, for the fix we're in is just wrong. It is just wrong. Affirmative action did not cause the great economic problems of the American middle class. And because most minorities or women are either members of that middle class or people who are poor who are struggling to get into it, we must also admit that affirmative action alone won't solve the problems of minorities and women who seek to be a part of the American dream. To do that, we have to have an economic strategy that reverses the decline in wages and the growth of poverty among working people. Without that, women, minorities, and white males will all be in trouble in the future.

But it is wrong to use the anxieties of the middle class to divert the American people from the real causes of their economic distress, the sweeping historic changes taking all the globe in its path and the specific policies or lack of them in our own country which have aggravated those challenges. It is simply wrong to play politics with the issue of affirmative action and divide our country at a time when, if we're really going to change things, we have to be united.

I must say, I think it is ironic that some of those—not all but some of those who call for an end to affirmative action also advocate policies which will make the real economic problems of the anxious middle class even worse. They talk about opportunity and being for equal opportunity for everyone, and then they reduce investment in equal opportunity on an evenhanded basis. For example, if the real goal is economic opportunity for all Americans, why in the world would we reduce our investment in education from Head Start to affordable college loans? Why don't we make college loans available to every American instead?

If the real goal is empowering all middle class Americans and empowering poor people to work their way into the middle class without regard to race or gender, why in the

world would the people who advocate that turn around and raise taxes on our poorest working families, or reduce the money available for education and training when they lose their jobs or they're living on poverty wages, or increase the cost of housing for lower income working people with children? Why would we do that? If we're going to empower America, we have to do more than talk about it. We have to do it. And we surely have learned that we cannot empower all Americans by a simple strategy of taking opportunity away from some Americans.

So to those who use this as a political strategy to divide us, we must say no. We must say no. But to those who raise legitimate questions about the way affirmative action works or who raise the larger question about the genuine problems and anxieties of all the American people and their sense of being left behind and treated unfairly, we must say yes, you are entitled to answers to your questions. We must say yes to that.

Now, that's why I ordered this review of all of our affirmative action programs, a review designed to look at the facts, not the politics, of affirmative action. This review concluded that affirmative action remains a useful tool for widening economic and educational opportunity. The model used by the military, the Army in particular—and I'm delighted to have the Commanding General of the Army here today because he set such a fine example—has been especially successful because it emphasizes education and training, ensuring that it has a wide pool of qualified candidates for every level of promotion. That approach has given us the most racially diverse and best qualified military in our history. There are more opportunities for women and minorities there than ever before. And now there are over 50 generals and admirals who are Hispanic, Asian, or African-Americans.

We found that the Education Department targeted on—had programs targeted on under-represented minorities that do a great deal of good with the tiniest of investments. We found that these programs comprised 40 cents of every \$1,000 in the Education Department's budget.

Now, college presidents will tell you that the education their schools offer actually

benefit from diversity, colleges where young people get the education and make the personal and professional contacts that will shape their lives. If their colleges look like the world they're going to live and work in and they learn from all different kinds of people things that they can't learn in books, our systems of higher education are stronger.

Still, I believe every child needs the chance to go to college—every child. That means every child has to have a chance to get affordable and repayable college loans, Pell grants for poor kids, and a chance to do things like join AmeriCorps and work their way through school. Every child is entitled to that. That is not an argument against affirmative action, it's an argument for more opportunity for more Americans until everyone is reached.

As I said a moment ago, the review found that the Small Business Administration last year increased loans to minorities by over two-thirds, loans to women by over 80 percent, did not decrease loans to white men, and not a single loan went to an unqualified person. People who never had a chance before to be part of the American system of free enterprise now have it. No one was hurt in the process. That made America stronger.

This review also found that the Executive order on employment practices of large Federal contractors also has helped to bring more fairness and inclusion into the work force.

Since President Nixon was here in my job, America has used goals and timetables to preserve opportunity and to prevent discrimination, to urge businesses to set higher expectations for themselves and to realize those expectations. But we did not and we will not use rigid quotas to mandate outcomes.

We also looked at the way we award procurement contracts under the programs known as set-asides. There's no question that these programs have helped to build up firms owned by minorities and women, who historically had been excluded from the old-boy networks in these areas. It has helped a new generation of entrepreneurs to flourish, opening new paths to self-reliance and an economic growth in which all of us ultimately share. Because of the set-asides, businesses

ready to compete have had a chance to compete, a chance they would not have otherwise had.

But as with any Government program, set-asides can be misapplied, misused, even intentionally abused. There are critics who exploit that fact as an excuse to abolish all these programs, regardless of their effects. I believe they are wrong, but I also believe, based on our factual review, we clearly need some reform. So first, we should crack down on those who take advantage of everyone else through fraud and abuse. We must crack down on fronts and pass-throughs, people who pretend to be eligible for these programs and aren't. That is wrong. We also, in offering new businesses a leg up, must make sure that the set-asides go to businesses that need them most. We must really look and make sure that our standard for eligibility is fair and defensible. We have to tighten the requirement to move businesses out of programs once they've had a fair opportunity to compete. The graduation requirement must mean something: It must mean graduation. There should be no permanent set-aside for any company.

Second, we must and we will comply with the Supreme Court's *Adarand* decision of last month. Now, in particular, that means focusing set-aside programs on particular regions and business sectors where the problems of discrimination or exclusion are provable and are clearly requiring affirmative action. I have directed the Attorney General and the agencies to move forward with compliance with *Adarand* expeditiously.

But I also want to emphasize that the *Adarand* decision did not dismantle affirmative action and did not dismantle set-asides. In fact, while setting stricter standards to mandate reform of affirmative action, it actually reaffirmed the need for affirmative action and reaffirmed the continuing existence of systematic discrimination in the United States. What the Supreme Court ordered the Federal Government to do was to meet the same more rigorous standard for affirmative action programs that State and local governments were ordered to meet several years ago. And the best set-aside programs under that standard have been challenged and have survived.

Third, beyond discrimination we need to do more to help disadvantaged people and distressed communities, no matter what their race or gender. There are places in our country where the free enterprise system simply doesn't reach; it simply isn't working to provide jobs and opportunity. Disproportionately, these areas in urban and rural America are highly populated by racial minorities, but not entirely. To make this initiative work, I believe the Government must become a better partner for people in places in urban and rural America that are caught in a cycle of poverty. And I believe we have to find ways to get the private sector to assume their rightful role as a driver of economic growth.

It has always amazed me that we have given incentives to our business people to help to develop poor economies in other parts of the world, our neighbors in the Caribbean, our neighbors in other parts of the world—I have supported this when not subject to their own abuses—but we ignore the biggest source of economic growth available to the American economy, the poor economies isolated within the United States of America.

There are those who say, "Well, even if we made the jobs available, people wouldn't work." They haven't tried. Most of the people in disadvantaged communities work today, and most of them who don't work have a very strong desire to do so. In central Harlem, 14 people apply for every single minimum-wage job opening. Think how many more would apply if there were good jobs with a good future. Our job has to connect disadvantaged people and disadvantaged communities to economic opportunity so that everybody who wants to work can do so.

We've been working at this through our empowerment zones and community development banks, through the initiatives of Secretary Cisneros of the Housing and Urban Development Department and many other things that we have tried to do to put capital where it is needed. And now I have asked Vice President Gore to develop a proposal to use our contracting to support businesses that locate themselves in these distressed areas or hire a large percentage of their workers from these areas, not to supplement what we're doing in affirmative action—not to sub-

stitute for it but to supplement it, to go beyond it, to do something that will help to deal with the economic crisis of America. We want to make our procurement system more responsive to people in these areas who need help.

My fellow Americans, affirmative action has to be made consistent with our highest ideals of personal responsibility and merit and our urgent need to find common ground and to prepare all Americans to compete in the global economy of the next century.

Today I am directing all our agencies to comply with the Supreme Court's *Adarand* decision, and also to apply the four standards of fairness to all our affirmative action programs that I have already articulated: No quotas in theory or practice; no illegal discrimination of any kind, including reverse discrimination; no preference for people who are not qualified for any job or other opportunity; and as soon as a program has succeeded, it must be retired. Any program that doesn't meet these four principles must be eliminated or reformed to meet them.

But let me be clear: Affirmative action has been good for America.

Affirmative action has not always been perfect, and affirmative action should not go on forever. It should be changed now to take care of those things that are wrong, and it should be retired when its job is done. I am resolved that that day will come. But the evidence suggests, indeed, screams that that day has not come.

The job of ending discrimination in this country is not over. That should not be surprising. We had slavery for centuries before the passage of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments. We waited another 100 years for the civil rights legislation. Women have had the vote less than 100 years. We have always had difficulty with these things, as most societies do. But we are making more progress than many people.

Based on the evidence, the job is not done. So here is what I think we should do. We should reaffirm the principle of affirmative action and fix the practices. We should have a simple slogan: Mend it, but don't end it.

Let me ask all Americans, whether they agree or disagree with what I have said today, to see this issue in the larger context of our

times. President Lincoln said, "We cannot escape our history." We cannot escape our future, either. And that future must be one in which every American has the chance to live up to his or her God-given capacities.

The new technology, the instant communications, the explosion of global commerce have created enormous opportunities and enormous anxieties for Americans. In the last 2½ years, we have seen 7 million new jobs, more millionaires and new businesses than ever before, high corporate profits, and a booming stock market. Yet, most Americans are working harder for the same or lower pay, and they feel more insecurity about their jobs, their retirement, their health care, and their children's education. Too many of our children are clearly exposed to poverty and welfare, violence and drugs.

These are the great challenges for our whole country on the homefront at the dawn of the 21st century. We've got to find the wisdom and the will to create family-wage jobs for all the people who want to work, to open the door of college to all Americans, to strengthen families and reduce the awful problems to which our children are exposed, to move poor Americans from welfare to work.

This is the work of our administration, to give people the tools they need to make the most of their own lives, to give families and communities the tools they need to solve their own problems. But let us not forget affirmative action didn't cause these problems. It won't solve them. And getting rid of affirmative action certainly won't solve them.

If properly done, affirmative action can help us come together, go forward, and grow together. It is in our moral, legal, and practical interest to see that every person can make the most of his own life. In the fight for the future, we need all hands on deck, and some of those hands still need a helping hand.

In our national community we're all different; we're all the same. We want liberty and freedom. We want the embrace of family and community. We want to make the most of our own lives, and we're determined to give our children a better one. Today there are voices of division who would say forget all that. Don't you dare. Remember we're

still closing the gap between our Founders' ideals and our reality. But every step along the way has made us richer, stronger, and better. And the best is yet to come.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:40 a.m. in the Rotunda. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. Dennis J. Reimer, USA, Chief of Staff, Army.

Memorandum on Affirmative Action *July 19, 1995*

*Memorandum for Heads of Executive
Departments and Agencies*

*Subject: Evaluation of Affirmative Action
Programs*

This Administration is committed to expanding the economy, to strengthening programs that support children and families, and to vigorous, effective enforcement of laws prohibiting discrimination. These commitments reflect bedrock values—equality, opportunity, and fair play—which extend to all Americans, regardless of race, ethnicity, or gender.

While our Nation has made enormous strides toward eliminating inequality and barriers to opportunity, the job is not complete. As the United States Supreme Court recognized only one month ago in *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña*. "[t]he unhappy persistence of both the practice and the lingering effects of racial discrimination against minority groups in this country is an unfortunate reality, and government is not disqualified from acting in response to it." This Administration will continue to support affirmative measures that promote opportunities in employment, education, and government contracting for Americans subject to discrimination or its continuing effects. In every instance, we will seek reasonable ways to achieve the objectives of inclusion and anti-discrimination without specific reliance on group membership. But where our legitimate objectives cannot be achieved through such means, the Federal Government will continue to support lawful consideration of race, ethnicity, and gender under programs that are flexible, realistic, subject to reevaluation, and fair.

Accordingly, in all programs you administer that use race, ethnicity, or gender as a consideration to expand opportunity or provide benefits to members of groups that have suffered discrimination, I ask you to take steps to ensure adherence to the following policy principles. The policy principles are that any program must be eliminated or reformed if it:

- (a) creates a quota;
- (b) creates preferences for unqualified individuals;
- (c) creates reverse discrimination; or
- (d) continues even after its equal opportunity purposes have been achieved.

In addition, the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña* requires strict scrutiny of the justifications for, and provisions of, a broad range of existing race-based affirmative action programs. You recently received a detailed legal analysis of *Adarand* from the Department of Justice. Consistent with that guidance, I am today instructing each of you to undertake, in consultation with and pursuant to the overall direction of the Attorney General, an evaluation of programs you administer that use race or ethnicity in decision making. With regard to programs that affect more than one agency, the Attorney General shall determine, after consultations, which agency shall take the lead in performing this analysis.

Using all of the tools at your disposal, you should develop any information that is necessary to evaluate whether your programs are narrowly tailored to serve a compelling interest, as required under *Adarand*'s strict scrutiny standard. Any program that does not meet the constitutional standard must be reformed or eliminated.

William J. Clinton

Satellite Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With the National Council of La Raza

July 19, 1995

The President. Thank you, Irma Flores Gonzalez, for that warm introduction, and thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your warm welcome.

I'm glad to see so many of my friends out there, and I want to say a special hello to your president, Raul Yzaguirre, and Irma's predecessor, Dr. Audrey Alvarado. The First Lady sends her regrets at not being able to be with you today. I hope you won't be too disappointed that I'm going to be her stand-in. I'm also sorry I can't be with you in person, as I was last year in Miami.

Just a little over an hour ago, at the National Archives here in Washington, I announced the results of our administration's review of Federal affirmative action programs and my convictions about what we ought to do with affirmative action. I made it clear that an essential part of our search for common ground in the exercise of our freedom is an unwavering commitment to genuine equal opportunity for all Americans. Affirmative action is simply a tool in the pursuit of that enduring national interest, equal opportunity.

Hispanics are making huge strides in ways we cannot have even imagined just a generation ago. I don't want any Hispanic child in America to feel that his or her race is an impediment to full achievement. Every child has a right to the American dream, and all of us have a responsibility to nourish that dream.

But until this country has achieved equality of opportunity, until we have stamped out discrimination, we will still need the remedy of affirmative action. It must be done the right way: It must be flexible; it must be fair; and it must work. Let me be clear: Our administration is against quotas; we're against guaranteed results; but we do need to guarantee genuine equality of opportunity for all Americans.

We want to support the programs that are working, and we want to get rid of the ones that aren't. If you ask me in a sentence what we need to do, I'd say we need to mend but not to end affirmative action. We ought to stay with our principles and fix whatever practices we need to fix.

Our study showed that, indeed, affirmative action has been an effective tool in expanding opportunity for those who have suffered discrimination, in the Army, in education, in small business loans, in employment by Federal contractors, in the set-aside programs.

We have seen again and again that when affirmative action is done in the right way it has helped more minorities and women to pursue the American dream, people like Paul Gutierrez in Omaha, who owns Midwest Maintenance, Ernest Gonzalez of West Babylon, New York, who owns a chemical distribution company, Santos Garza of Bethesda, Maryland, who owns a security company.

After 25 years of experience, we know that these programs can work, but we also know that there have been some problems with them. So it is time to take a good look at what's working and what isn't. That's why I announced the series of steps that we'll take to change and to improve our approach to affirmative action. First, we want to crack down on those who take advantage of other people who deserve the program through their own fraud and abuse. We'll still offer new businesses a leg up, but we're going to make sure the set-asides go to the businesses that need them most.

Second, we're going to comply with the Supreme Court's decision in the *Adarand* case last month. That means focusing set-asides to regions and business sectors where the serious problems of discrimination are clear and provable. I have directed the Attorney General and the agencies to move forward with this expeditiously. The *Adarand* decision did require us to improve the way in which we do affirmative action, but I want all of you to understand, it did not dismantle set-asides. In fact, a huge majority of the Supreme Court, seven of the nine Justices, reaffirmed the need for good affirmative action because of the continuing evidence of discrimination in our national life.

The stricter standards of *Adarand* have been met by State and local governments who were ordered several years ago to adhere to these standards. And the best State and local set-asides that have been challenged have met the standards and survived the challenge.

The third thing we need to do is to help disadvantaged people and distressed communities wherever they are and regardless of their race or gender. That's what we tried to do in the empowerment zone program. And that's why I've asked Vice President

Gore to develop a proposal to use our contracting in the Government to support businesses that locate themselves in truly distressed areas or that hire many of their workers from these areas.

The truth is that there are whole pockets of America that have been left behind in the free enterprise system. And we need to give people incentives to invest in those areas and those people, not as a substitute for affirmative action but as a supplement to it. We need to do this. Most of these areas will be disproportionately minority but not all of them will be. I am convinced we have got to focus on getting people who are in these isolated areas, whether they're in rural or urban areas, the benefits of the American dream. We cannot grow the American economy in the 21st century if we continue to have pockets of abject poverty where people are dying to go to work.

I have also directed all our agencies to apply four standards of fairness to all our affirmative action programs: first, no quotas or any inflexible numerical straitjackets in theory or in practice; second, no illegal discrimination of any kind, including reverse discrimination; third, no preferential treatment for people who are not qualified; and finally, when a program has met its goal it must be retired. Any program that doesn't meet these four principles must be eliminated or reformed.

Affirmative action has been good for America. That doesn't mean it's always been perfect. It doesn't mean it should go on forever. It should be retired when its job is done, and I am resolved that that day will come. But you and I know that job is not done yet, and we do not need to abandon affirmative action.

It is my firm belief that our diversity can be America's greatest strength in the 21st century. We're going into an information age. We have to be prepared to compete and win in the global economy, with all of its different cultures. And we are so well positioned in this country, with well over 150 different racial and ethnic groups, with opening opportunities to women as well as men but we have to say to ourselves honestly, we are not where we need to be. And we're going to need everyone pulling together if our country is

going to move into the 21st century in good shape. So we can't back away from our commitment to expand equal opportunity and to require responsibility from every single American.

You know, I ran for President to do two things: First, to restore the American dream of opportunity and the American value of responsibility; and second, to bring the American people together again, so that we could move into the next century together. I have learned in the past 2½ years that we can't do one without the other. We can't solve our economic problems or our social problems unless we do them together and unless we come together. We all have to bring the American people together.

That's really the bottom line of this debate about affirmative action. You and I and all Americans have to sit down and find a way to bridge the great divides in our society. We have to find a way to honor our diversity in the context of our shared values, our shared interests, and our shared commitments to both equal opportunity and to high standards of qualification and performance. If we do this, we'll be stronger; we'll be better prepared as a nation to meet the challenges that lie ahead.

By the year 2010, Latinos will be the largest minority group in our country. Your voices and your talents are absolutely critical to lead us into the new century. You're already doing that in many ways, in daily life and in public service.

We should all be grateful for the work that all of you do, but I want to mention one of your number in particular, New Mexico Congressman Bill Richardson. He did a great job in Haiti. He did a great job in North Korea. And I know how proud all of you are, and I can hear by your applause, at the work he did, the brilliant work he did to help to bring home the two Americans who were wrongfully imprisoned in Iraq. He is a great American and every American should be grateful to him for what he did.

Just last week at the Southwest Voter Registration and Education Dinner, Vice President Gore announced my intention to honor another great American, Willie Valasquez, with the Presidential Medal of Freedom. I am honored to honor the memory of a man

who gave all of us so much. For too long, Latinos were deprived of the chance to serve in the highest levels of government. This was a loss for your community and a loss for our Nation. We are a rich country but not so rich that we can afford to waste the talents of so many of our best people. Willie Valasquez knew this, his memory and legacy are alive in every corner of our administration.

And as we continue to move forward together, you know that we have more to do. But there are already more than 2 times as many Hispanic appointees in our administration than in the previous two administrations. In addition to Henry Cisneros at HUD and Federico Peña at the Department of Transportation, there are so many others who are contributing to our country and our future.

Let me just make one other point in closing, and then I know you have a question or two. You have to help us as a country make sure that this affirmative action program is not used as one more way to divide middle class and working poor Americans.

The real problem that is driving this new debate on affirmative action is a problem you know well. The ground is moving under America. Look at the last 2½ years. I have instituted a new economic strategy that has helped to bring us 7 million jobs. We have an enormous increase in the number of new businesses, the highest on record. We have more new millionaires than ever before. The stock market is at an all time high. Corporate profits are high. But you know what? More than half the American people are working harder today for the same or lower wages they were making 2½ years ago. More than half of our people still feel insecure about their jobs, their health care, their retirements, their ability to educate their children. Now, these are things that we have to face.

I know Secretary Dick Riley has already talked with you about the need to strengthen our commitment to education. But before I go on that, I want you to focus on this. A lot of this heat on affirmative action is being generated by people who want to blame minorities, who want to blame women's groups, and who want to blame the Federal Government and this administration for the economic distress of the middle class. It's been building for decades, and we have a strategy

to do something about it. Affirmative action: it did not cause the economic problems of middle class America. And affirmative action alone will not solve all the economic problems of women and racial minorities in this country.

So what we have to do is to say, let's look at affirmative action on its own merits. Let's realize we're all stronger when we grow together. But let's also recognize that we have to have a strategy to lift this country up. Don't let the people who are pursuing policies that will drive us down and drive us apart prevail by preying on the legitimate anxieties of middle class Americans to get this country moving for them again.

That all begins with a commitment, a renewed commitment to education. This issue is so important to all of us here that I just want to take one minute to echo and amplify what Secretary Riley said to you. Affirmative action without a commitment to education won't work. School is where young people learn the skills to pursue middle class dreams. It's where middle class values are taught and where parents can know that the teachers will reinforce things like responsibility and honesty and trustworthiness and hard work and caring for one another and for our natural environment, where good citizenship can be taught and where it can be modeled.

A good education has always been key to unlocking the promise of tomorrow. And today, more than ever, those without it are being left behind. That's why, under our plan, we can balance the budget and increase educational investment by \$40 billion in proven programs that work, from expanding Head Start to more affordable and repayable college loans.

The plan of the Republican majority in Congress will balance the budget, all right, but it cuts education by \$36 billion, right at the time when we need to be doing more to prepare our young people to take their productive places in the global economy. It does not make sense. It also doesn't make sense for them to cut funds on the fight on crime, cut our investments in safe and drug-free schools. There are a lot of things that don't make sense.

So, as we work in the coming months to balance the budget, I hope you'll help me

do it in the right way. If we take a little longer and we don't give huge tax cuts to people who don't really need it, we can invest in middle class Americans and in poor Americans who were determined to work their way into the middle class.

You and I know it would be self-defeating to cut our investments in education. Cutting education today would be like cutting defense budgets at the height of the cold war. Our national security depends upon our ability to educate all of our people, to give them the tools they need to make the most of their own lives.

Our mission, yours and mine together, must be to build a bridge to the future so that every American can cross it. We have to give every Latino and every other American the power they all need to make the most of their own lives and to give their children better lives. That's what's behind my approach to affirmative action. That's what's behind my commitment to education. That's what's behind my economic strategy. I want our children's generation to inherit an America with as much new opportunity as the one into which I was brought into. If people take the kind of responsibility you have taken to make our country better and we do the right things here, we will be better.

I thank you for your service to your community. I thank you for your service to your country. I ask you to stay at it, stand up for the proposition that all of us are going forward together.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

Q. Mr. President, we have three important questions we want to ask. I will ask the first one. A recent NCLR report shows that Hispanic women are the lowest paid workers in the country and there is substantial evidence that Latinos experience discrimination on the basis of both national origin and gender. In light of your speech earlier today, how do you see the administration addressing the needs and interests of Hispanic women?

The President. Thank you.

First of all, I'd like to talk a little bit about our survey. In our Working Women Count Campaign, conducted by Secretary Reich at the Department of Labor with the able assistance of Hermalinda Pompa of the Women's Bureau, we circulated a questionnaire

to working women. Two hundred and fifty thousand Hispanic women replied. They told us they were interested in pay and benefits, in having the ability to both work and to care for their children, and in making sure that women could be valued and treated properly and fairly in the workplace.

We are determined to do what we can to advance this cause. First of all, we want to make sure Hispanic women understand the rights and opportunities to which they're entitled as working Americans. And we have translated into Spanish, for example, information on the family leave law, information on the sexual harassment laws, information on pregnancy and other employment discrimination practices. I think that is very important.

But secondly, and even more important, we have to pursue an economic agenda that will help Hispanic women. We, first of all, have to raise the minimum wage. There are 300,000 Hispanic women in this country who would make an average of more than \$1,800 a year more than they're making now and put another \$1 billion into the American economy if we raised the minimum wage. And if we don't raise the minimum wage, next year, in terms of its real buying power, the minimum wage will fall to a 40-year low.

One of the real big fights we're having up here in Washington today is the fight between my vision of a smart-work, high-wage future and the alternative vision of a high-profit but hard-work and low-wage future. I think it's clear which one is in the best interest of the American people. We ought to start with raising the minimum wage.

The second thing we need to do is to pass the "GI bill of rights for America's workers," which includes consolidating all the various Government training programs into one big pool and then giving people who are unemployed or under-employed the right to a voucher worth \$2,600 a year for 2 years, which they can take to the local community college or anyplace else if they want to get retraining and education after they have left high school and when they're in the work force. That is a very important proposal we have made that has achieved—gotten too little attention. I think we have a chance to pass it, and we ought to do so.

The third thing that we ought to do in my opinion is to concentrate tax relief on middle income families and on child-rearing and education costs. That will help Hispanic women enormously.

The fourth thing we need to do is to pass the welfare reform bill that has been proposed in the United States Senate by Senator Barbara Mikulski, Senator Daschle, and Senator Breaux, which focuses on giving people who are on welfare the child care they need so that they can be able to go to work, they can be required to work, and we can end welfare as we know it by helping people be good parents.

So these are just some of the things that I think we ought to do, and I hope you'll help me implement it. We have to win this budget fight. All this is going to play out in the context of the budget fight. Our budget fight is good for growing Americans. It's good for children. It's good for middle class people. It's good for people who want to work their way out of poverty. And we have to win it.

Q. Thank you Mr. President. This is Raul Yzaguirre. Let me first state how gratified we are to learn of your posture on affirmative action. And we support and we stand by you on that posture and that position.

You will, however, recall that your administration received some criticism early on for its appointments and its appointment record with respect to Hispanic-Americans. Since then, there have been gains and some losses, particularly within the White House itself. Furthermore, there is a perception that you have not enjoyed the benefit of frequent consultation with Latino community leaders on key issues of importance to the Latino community. Will you commit today to begin to practice affirmative action for Hispanics within your own administration and particularly in the White House itself? And further, what steps are you prepared to take to improve the quantity and the quality of your consultations with the Hispanic community?

The President. Well, first of all, let's deal with the facts as they exist. Our administration has appointed more Hispanics than any administration in history, more than twice as many as either of the previous two, and several hundred. We also have major domestic

policy considerations in the hands of Secretary Cisneros and Secretary Peña.

I've also had the privilege, as you know, to have the regular counsel of the head of the EEOC, Gil Casellas; Norma Cantu at the Department of Education; Maria Echaveste at the Department of Labor; Nelson Diaz at HUD; George Munoz at Treasury, Aida Alvarez at HUD, Fernando Torres-Gil at HHS, Katherine Archuleta at Transportation and Joaq Otero at Labor, among others.

And at the White House, as you know, we have lost some people, but we still have an awful lot of talented Latinos on our staff. In fact, one of them made history this afternoon. Carolyn Curiel personally helped me craft my affirmative action speech. She had more to do with drafting it than anybody else. And she is the first person of color and, more importantly, the first Latino in the history of our country to write speeches for the President. And it may be that the one she wrote today will go down as one of the two or three most important I have ever delivered. In the White House, as you know, she's joined by Rick Hernandez, Janet Maguida, Ray Martinez, Liz Montoya, Suzanne Ramos, Suzanna Valdez, Vicki Rivas-Vazquez, Araceli Ruano, and others.

Now, I want to answer you two questions here.

Number one, I am always looking for more good people for important appointments to boards and commissions and other things. But I want to point out again, if you look at my record on judges, I have appointed more than 3 times as many Hispanic judges in the first 2 years of my Presidency as Presidents Reagan, Bush, and Carter combined did in the first 2 years of their Presidency. And in only 2 years, I have appointed more judges than any other administration in history. So I think my record is pretty good on that. I do want to continue to do better. And I do believe that there is more we can do.

Now, on the consultation issue, I really think that's one I really need to put back on you because my perception is that we have reached out, and we have consulted, and we have had a lot of good meetings that were more than just briefings but were really asking for input. If you don't believe that's true, then what I think you ought to do is make

a proposal to me and let me see if I can accommodate it so that we can give you and all the people you represent and the people that you work so hard for and do such a wonderful job for the feeling that they do have an open door and a listening ear at the White House, because in the end that is maybe the most important thing.

I have to keep working on these appointments because that empowers people who, in turn, send ripples all across the country. A lot of these judges, for example, will serve for 20 or 30 or more years and will make decisions that will, together, affect millions and millions of people in positive ways.

But while I am here, your feeling of access and involvement and participation in this administration is perhaps the single most important thing that I can give you. So I want to say again, I would like to invite you to make a proposal about how you think we should do it, what the right way to do it is. I will do my best to accommodate it and, in any case, we will make sure that people feel that we are moving this issue forward.

Q. Mr. President, we accept your invitation, and you will have a proposal on your desk Monday morning.

We have one last question of extreme urgency and importance to many of the people in this room today that we'd like to ask. You have spoken out, Mr. President, eloquently against the forces of hate that led to the Oklahoma City bombing and the need for greater civility in public debates.

We could not agree with you more. We live in a time of almost unprecedented immigrant bashing which we, in our community, view as a manifestation of these forces of hate. All Latinos, including the majority of us who are native-born citizens, feel we are targets of this rising tide of hate. You clarified this morning the need for all of us to come together in a united front. How do you plan to include those of us that are immigrants, those of us that look like immigrants in this plan to unite America?

The President. Well, first of all, let me say that I think there is a rising tide of—it's sort of the same—I view the immigration issue rather like the affirmative action issue. In the case of affirmative action, I think there were legitimate questions raised about the

way the programs work and whether they need reform. There were even some who asked honestly whether affirmative action was the right or wrong thing for America. And then there were a whole lot of people that were using affirmative action to drive a political wedge in this country as a false excuse for the problems of the American middle class and the economic anxieties broadly felt by Americans.

I think the immigration issue has sort of flared up again, in my judgment, driven by two factors. One is the general economic anxiety of Americans and the feeling that we are at an all-time high in the number of immigrants we let in every year, and that that may be depressing wages and causing economic difficulties.

But I think the far more important problem is the sense that this country has been very undisciplined in its handling of illegal immigration in ways that have cost the taxpayers an awful lot of money and undermined our sense that our laws matter. And so, I think we need to have the same attitude about immigration that I have about affirmative action.

This is a country of immigrants. The fact that we have so many immigrants in this country and that they come from so many different places, from so many different racial ethnic and religious backgrounds is a mother lode of opportunity for us. The fact that Hispanics are fast-moving to become our largest minority population is a godsend, given the fact that for the next 20 to 30 to 50 years our greatest opportunity for growth and trade will be in Mexico, Central and South America, and in the Caribbean. So I see this as a positive force.

And I think we have to do several things. Let me just mention some of the things we are trying to do. I think we have to examine our immigration policies in a factual, calm, nonpolitical way just as we try to do with affirmative action. I think we need to do whatever we can to reduce the burden of illegal immigration without unduly hurting innocent children.

As you know, I opposed Proposition 187 in California. I was unsuccessful, but I did my best. And I did it because I thought it was unfair to children and counterproductive

and self-defeating. On the other hand, I noticed that the post-election polls showed that significant percentages of Hispanic-Americans voted for it, not a majority but a significant percentage. And I think the reason is that a lot of people don't like having people who deliberately violate our laws spend our tax money. I think that is a very—it is very hard to defend that practice, and I don't intend to defend it.

So I have tried to keep America open as an immigration-friendly society while toughening our ability to enforce our own immigration laws and to deport people who are here illegally, especially those who come in contact with the criminal justice system. I also believe, however, it's very important that legal immigrants be encouraged to pursue their citizenship and that we do what we can to accelerate it.

I would like to look at this note here. We naturalized in 1994 half a million people. That's a 50-percent increase over 1992. And we're trying to break that record this year. I have directed the INS to get an extra almost \$10 million to help to process people for naturalization. We're trying to get volunteers. We're doing everything we can in that regard. And I have repeatedly spoken out against immigrant bashing and negative feelings.

So I think that what we need to do is to have a sensible approach to immigration. It needs to be open. It needs to be nondogmatic and nonbigoted. We need to be firm but reasonable in the way we deal with the problem of illegal immigration. And we need to try to get as many of our immigrants who want to do so to become citizens as quickly as possible so that the American people will all see that this is a part of the process of American history which is a good one for our country.

Q. Mr. President, we thank you very much. And you'll have our proposal on Monday. And we're here to help you with advice if you need us. Thank you very much.

The President. I always need it. I thank you. For the members of the Hispanic community who gave me advice and had input on the affirmative action speech, let me thank you especially. This was a very important day for America. I hope that what I said

and the way it was said will reach the hearts and minds of the vast majority of the American people. I believed it very deeply. And I thank all of you who have had any input on that directly or indirectly.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke by satellite at 2:16 p.m. from room 459 in the Old Executive Office Building to the convention meeting in Dallas, TX. In his remarks, he referred to Irma Flores-Gonzalez, chairman of the board, NCLR; and Willie Velasquez, who was executive director, Southwest Voters Registration and Education Project.

Satellite Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With the National Conference of State Legislatures

July 20, 1995

The President. Thank you, Jane Campbell, for your gracious introduction and for all the great work you've done as president of the NCSL. I saw your mother yesterday morning at my affirmative action speech, and I wonder who you're going to produce in your family to start tomorrow off right for me. I'm very glad to see you again.

I want to wish your incoming president, Jim Lack, the best of luck in the coming year. I think he can expect interesting times as well.

Let me express my thanks to your NCSL vice president, Mike Box; your former president, Bob Connor; two of your assembly chairs, my good friend, Dan Blue, and Representative Bill Purcell, with whom I enjoyed working at the Vice President's family conference in Nashville recently. It's great to be here with all of you, even if I'm only here by satellite.

You know, the image that is bringing me to you traveled from Washington to a satellite about 22,000 miles away in space, and then back down to Milwaukee, a total of 44,000 miles. Back when I was a Governor there were times when I felt that Washington was that far away. And it's been very important to me, as you said, to try to make you feel

that we're not 44,000 miles away, that we're not living on a different planet, that we can stay in touch with you and that we can work together.

For 12 years I lived with State government, and I saw how it can be the laboratory of our democracy. I know how you drive us forward as a nation with your innovation, your will to experiment responsibly, and your common sense. You are the inspiration for so much of what we're trying to do up here. And I thank you very much for that.

America's State legislators have had a very productive year. I noticed that in Utah, West Virginia, New Mexico, and Montana, statutes were enacted that permit employers to establish medical savings accounts for health care. Delaware and Ohio have led the way with truly meaningful welfare reform legislation that is focused on protecting our children and moving people from welfare to work, something I've been laboring with for 15 years now. And I understand that those of you from Iowa saw fit to put diaper-changing tables in all the Statehouse restrooms. Now if that is not a sincere commitment to family values, I don't know what is.

For many of you, your work for the year is done. But in Washington, as you know, we've still got a very long way to go. When I ran for President as the Governor of my State, I did it for two reasons. First, I thought that, on the verge of the 21st century, we were in danger of losing the American dream of opportunity for all and in danger of losing our sense of responsibility with all the social problems that were tearing our country apart. So I wanted to restore opportunity and a sense of responsibility.

But I also wanted to bring the American people together as a community. Politics has been used too long to divide us when what we really need to do is to rise above partisanship to find common ground. In order to do that, Washington needs to inspire the trust of more people throughout the country with a Government that empowers people to make the most of their own lives, empowers communities to solve their own problems, and is far less bureaucratic and less proscriptive.

Now, in the last 2½ years I believe we've produced some real achievements. The econ-

omy is up; inflation is low; trade is expanding; interest rates and unemployment are down. The facts speak for themselves. In the last 2 years we have cut the deficit by a third, and we're in the process of reducing it for 3 years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President. We have put in place more than 80 new trade agreements, including NAFTA and the GATT world trade agreement and an historic pact to finally, finally open Japan's markets to American cars and American auto parts.

These efforts have added about 7 million new jobs to our economy, and almost all of them have been in the private sector. To give you an idea of what that means, it's like creating a job for every person in Delaware, Idaho, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, and Wyoming combined. In 1993 our country established more new businesses than ever before, and in 1994 Americans broke that record again.

One of the best pieces of evidence that this country is turning around is right in the room here. The report NCSL issued for this conference, the report the New York Times put on its front page on Sunday, says that the finances of the State are, and I quote, "the best they have been since the 1980's." Last year employment grew in all 50 States and independent forecasters expect the same thing to happen again this year.

I have only one thing to say to that. As good as this is, you ain't seen nothing yet if we stay on the same course. We couldn't have done all this without a strong commitment to changing the way the Government does the people's business here in Washington, because the old Federal ways and the old Federal bureaucracy were not going to permit the kind of changes that we have to make as a country to get to the 21st century.

Our Federal work force is well on its way to being the smallest it's been since John Kennedy was President. It will be in just another year or two. Already, we've cut well over 100,000 positions from the Government; hundreds of programs have been abolished. Just last month, we got rid of 16,000 pages in the Federal Code of Regulations. Fifty percent of the regulations at the Small Business Administration are on their way to being history. We've reduced that budget by

40 percent and doubled the number of small business loans.

Forty percent of the Education Department's regulations are being scrapped. And as you know, that will directly help a lot of you. The time it takes to fill out EPA regulations has been cut by 25 percent. And we're now telling small businesses around America, if you call the EPA and you ask for help on a problem, you cannot be fined for 6 months while you try to work it out.

Reinventing Government means reinventing the way the Federal Government does business with you as well. Our job has been to bring together all levels of government to cooperate, to find common ground, to actually work together to solve our Nation's problems, instead of just talking about them. We have worked very hard to forge a genuine partnership between the States and the National Government.

I learned about the importance of this partnership a long time ago. When I was the Governor, in Little Rock the legislature and the Governor's offices were close together, just one floor apart in the Capitol. We saw each other all the time. Legislators dropped by my office at any time of the day or night during the legislative sessions. Many legislators even came to the Governor's morning planning meetings. There was a spirit of teamwork, a tremendous amount of goodwill, and an awful lot of good came out of it.

As you know, unfortunately, we too often don't work that way in Washington. I am doing my best to build on that tradition to go beyond partisanship to finding common ground and actually solving a lot of these issues.

I've also tried to give you more say in your own affairs. We have now given 29 States a total of 33 waivers from Federal rules to enact their own welfare reform proposals. In the last 2½ years, more States have received waivers than in the previous 12 years of the previous two administrations combined. We have also given 10 States waivers to carry out major health care reform initiatives.

I did sign, as Jane said, the Unfunded Mandates Act, which restricts Congress from passing new mandates on State and local governments without paying for them. From now on, Congress will not be able to take

you out for a 10-course dinner and then stick you with the check.

We have proposed setting up performance partnerships with you. Under this initiative, you would have a real say in how Federal programs are run in your State. But in exchange for more flexibility and more freedom to innovate, you would also be more accountable for the results.

The list goes on. OSHA and the EPA no longer play cops and robbers with you as they used to. We're moving away from punishment to compliance as a goal. FEMA used to be a disaster, but all of you who had to use it in the last 2½ years know that it is a genuine disaster agency now, helping States all across our country to respond quickly and efficiently and compassionately to crises.

Even though we've made strides, I know we still have a lot to do. That's why I have submitted my balanced budget plan, which I believe is important because of the way it balances the budget and because of the things that it still does in the budget both for the American people and with the American States.

All of you have to balance your budget, and you know it's important. The United States never had a structural deficit until about 12 years ago. Before, when we ran deficits, it was just because of economic conditions. But from 1981 until the day I took office, we quadrupled the debt of this country. And we were in a position where we were going to have deficits forever and ever, with all the economic weakness that that implies.

I know what you have to do and the tough choices you have to make. I used to do it every year for 12 years. We are now at an historic moment, because for the first time in a long time, the leaders of both parties in Washington agree that we must balance the budget. The Congress has a budget plan that I have differences with, but at least we share this common goal. And I am confident we are going to be able to work together to balance the budget and to help all Americans achieve the objectives of a balanced budget, a stronger economy, and a brighter future for ourselves and our children.

But in the meanwhile, we need to be honest and open about our differences, and there are real differences. The biggest difference

is the difference between necessary cuts and unacceptable and ultimately self-defeating pain. Our balanced budget plan cuts spending by more than \$1 trillion. It cuts non-defense discretionary spending by an average of 20 percent across the board, except for education. The congressional plan wants to make deep cuts in education and training, while I want to increase our investment in education, because that is essential to our ability to meet the challenges of the next century.

Let me say also that I am very concerned about the direction that the House Appropriations Committee seems to be going with regard to the bill which includes funding for key education and training initiatives. The bill they've come up with would eliminate the Goals 2000 program. It would drastically cut back the School-to-Work initiatives that we have used to help all of you establish systems in your own State to move everybody who doesn't go on to 4-year colleges into a continuing education program.

And let me stop and say that when I became President I knew that the United States was the only advanced economy in the world that had no system for the young people who did not go on to 4-year universities. We all have our community colleges; we all have our vocational schools; we all are blessed with private sector employers that try to provide people on-the-job training. But we had no system on a State-by-State basis in all 50 States for keeping up with those young people who don't go to the 4-year schools and making sure that they can make the transition from school to work in a job with a chance to have a growing, not a shrinking income. So I think it's a mistake to walk away from the School-to-Work program.

They also want to effectively gut the Safe and Drug-free Schools and Communities program. I know that a lot of you have schools that need more help with security measures, that need more help with drug prevention measures, and that you cannot provide this money on your own. The Safe and Drug-free Schools program has enabled all the schools of our country to access the resources they need to try to have the schools be safe and drug free. This House proposed budget would also deny Pell grants to

300,000 students who want to attend college. And it would cut job training for hundreds of thousands of Americans just when we need to help our people build the skills to meet the demands of the 21st century.

If Congress sends me this bill in its present form, I will have to veto it because it will weaken our economy and it will undermine the good that we can do by balancing the budget. The congressional plan will also cut Medicare in a way that could impose huge costs on the elderly. We have to reduce the rate at which Medicare costs are increasing. We can reform the Medicare program, but we have to make sure that it will be intact for Americans who need it.

Congress also has a plan that will give very large tax cuts that will primarily go to people who are better off. I think the tax cuts are too large and will require cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, and education that are too large. But if we simply cut taxes for people who really need it, cutting taxes for middle-class people so that they can invest that money in their children and in their education, we can afford a sizable tax cut, balance the budget, and continue to invest in our fundamental needs.

The congressional plan would balance the budget in 7 years. I believe that that is too fast. We have had a deficit since 1969. We have had a huge structural deficit for 12 years. We've already cut the deficit for 3 years in a row. I think it is better to take a little more time so that we can continue to invest in education, protect Medicare, protect our relationships and our partnerships with you, and invest in the things that will grow our economy. If we can balance the budget in 10 years without doing that kind of harm, we ought to take more time and do it right.

So I say, let's balance the budget, but let's balance the budget in 10 years, not 7 years. We cannot expect to undo these decades of fiscal damages overnight. And we must continue to make investments here at the national level, in education, in investments in science and technology and the environment, and obviously, in Medicare and Medicaid.

How we balance the budget is as important as balancing it. Just 3 extra years will preserve the dreams of millions of Ameri-

cans. And it will strengthen our economy. We get all the economic benefits of balancing the budget, and the economic benefits of opening the doors of college education to all with affordable and repayable loans; continuing to increase the impact of Head Start for our young people; and being able to create a genuine big training program for unemployed and underemployed people, so that we can get rid of all these many, many dozens of Federal training programs and still have enough money to put in this block so that people who lose their jobs or are underemployed can have access to training which they can take to the local community college or any other place of their choice.

Now, to me, this choice is clear, and I hope you will agree. I was gratified to learn that yesterday, your Federal budget and taxation committee passed a resolution calling for a balanced Federal budget within 10 years. That will enable us to maintain our partnership.

The congressional budget would also do something else. I believe it would put an unfair burden on every one of you. Anybody who's worked in State government in the 1980's learned a very painful lesson. Washington's budget decisions all throughout the eighties gave us too many problems and too few resources. States were stuck with a horrible combination of more mandates and less funding. I know there are people in this room who worked night and day to see to it that the citizens of your State were taken care of, but it wasn't easy. There was an awful lot of unnecessary pain. And I don't see any reason on Earth why we ought to go through that again. But that is exactly what could happen with the congressional budget.

It sounds good. It calls for block grants for Medicaid and food stamps. But I have to tell you, I have real doubts that these block grants would be able to keep pace with the demands that you are going to face in your individual States. And in the real world, remember that economies change, populations rise, needs evolve. As those things happen you could be locked into a grant that could lock you into a real bind. And no matter how great a job you've done getting your own fiscal house in order, no matter how hard you've worked to prepare your State for the

next century, you'll have to respond. And that could mean putting the working families of your State, the children of your State, the elderly of your State either in dire straits at the moment that we need to be doing everything we can to help them to make the most of their own lives, or forcing you to raise taxes when that might not be in the economic interests of your State or your people.

Should the States have more responsibility? Of course, they should. I'm doing my best to give you more. Should you deliver primary services? You always have. Should we in Washington do more than we have to free you up? Absolutely, we should. But we ought to do it in partnership. Simply moving the bureaucracy from one place to another or shifting the problems from one level to another is nothing more than a shell game. Giving you the responsibility without the resources could be disastrous. We can do better than that. We can get rid of this deficit. We can give our people the tools they need to make the most of their own God-given talents, and we can give our States more flexibility.

The budget process is entering a crucial stage now. If there was ever a time for you to add your voices the time is now. We need to get to work and we need to do it in a bipartisan fashion. I have the feeling that even today at the State level there is less partisanship, less ideological argument and more willingness to roll up your sleeves and get down to work than there is too often here in Washington.

You can help us with that. We need an infusion of that. We can solve the problems of this country. We can give you more flexibility, balance the budget, still invest in our people as we need. But to do it, we have to look beyond the hot air and the harsh talk and try to find common ground.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

Representative Jane Campbell. Thank you, Mr. President. It is now my pleasure to call upon two of our colleagues to pose questions to President Clinton. The first is NCSL's incoming president, Senator Lack of New York.

Senator Lack.

Senator Jim Lack. Good morning, Mr. President.

The President. Good morning, Senator.

Senator Lack. As I assume the presidency of NCSL I certainly look forward to continuing the relationship between our organization and you and your administration, and would like to take this opportunity to extend an invitation to you to join with us next year at our conference in St. Louis if you can.

The President. Thank you.

Senator Lack. Mr. President, you alluded to block grants. State legislators, for many years, have supported the flexibility provided by block grants and performance partnerships. However, the worst scenario we could imagine would be to receive block grants that really aren't block grants. Will you support us in keeping block grant legislation free of mandates and other proscriptive elements?

The President. Well, first of all, I agree with you that if we're going to have a block grant program, it ought to be as free as possible of proscriptive mandates, consistent with the larger objectives of the program. The community development block grant program that I used as a Governor, that presumably many of you still take full advantage of at the State level, worked pretty well in that regard.

And I am generally in favor of pushing more and more decisionmaking away from the Federal Government, down to the States; and where appropriate, not only to local government, but to private citizens as well. For example, I have proposed this "GI bill for America's workers," which would take these 70 Labor Department job training programs and just get rid of them, put it into a block, and when someone is unemployed, they can apply and get a voucher worth \$2,600 a year for up to 2 years to take to your local community college or wherever else they want to get the training.

We have given, as I said in my remarks, welfare reform waivers to 29 States, and we have more pending. I am opposed to Washington's micromanagement, whether it comes from the right or the left. And I have been very concerned that in the welfare reform debate we were going to wind up, under the guise of giving the States more responsibility, essentially putting more details on the States and putting the States in an economic bind.

Right now, the welfare reform bill is stalled in the Senate because some of those mostly on the extreme conservative end of the Senate believe that it doesn't contain enough mandates to, for example, prohibit any funds going to teenage mothers who have children out of wedlock and to their children.

I believe that what we ought to do, consistent with the very few things we know—I've worked on welfare reform for 15 years—we know a few things. We know that most people on welfare will go to work if they're given a chance to do it. We know that the absence of child care is a big problem, a barrier. And we know that the States will figure all this out if they have the tools to do it right. So what I want to do in the welfare reform debate is to give you the maximum amount of flexibility, consistent with some simple objectives. I do think the only place we need Federal rules and welfare reform—and you and I, I think, have talked about this before—is in the area of child support enforcement because so many of those cases cross State lines.

So I'm going to do my best to get you a welfare reform proposal which gives more flexibility to the States and doesn't have a lot of ideological proscriptions one any or the other and just focuses on one or two big things that need to be done. I think that is the right way to do it.

Let me just say one other thing, though, about these block grants. Block grants are very good if they can be used by you for the purpose for which they're intended, and they don't have some trap down the road. So, for example, with the community development block grant, the dollar amount I got was held constant for a decade. So, in real terms, it got smaller and smaller and smaller. But since I didn't have a dependent population that had to have it every year we were able to work and make the most of it, use it to create jobs in my State without causing any problems anywhere else.

Now, if we turn food stamps into a block grant, what are we going to do the first time we don't have all 50 States growing? The food stamp program, because it goes to people in need, worked very well in the 1980's when, first of all, we had the so-called bicoastal economy. The coasts were doing

well and the heartland was doing terribly. Then when the heartland and the Middle West and the South came back, the coast got in trouble, the food stamp program worked as an economic stabilizer as well as a personal safety net, moving back and forth across the States to help deal with the problems of those States. I think that there's a real potential for problems for you in that.

And I feel the same way about Medicaid. If you have a Medicaid block grant with—particularly with all the other problems you've got, what are we going to do the first time that there's a terrible but uneven recession in America?

And in the case of the welfare program, if there were an AFDC block grant with no local participation requirement, look what that could do to you. What are you going to do if you get cut across the board, Medicaid cuts, education cuts, welfare cuts, and you've got a welfare block grant with no local participation requirement, and then that money becomes the target of every lobby group in your State legislature that needs it? What's going to happen to the poor children in your State?

So what I think we need to do is to be very practical about this, not ideological; use the block grants where they'll work, and give you as much flexibility as possible to be creative. The Federal Government should be defining the objectives we want to achieve, and unless we have absolute, clear, unambiguous evidence that some condition or another is a precondition of achieving that objective, we ought to give you the maximum amount of creativity. That's what I tried to do with this waiver process, and that's the direction I think we ought to take.

Representative Campbell. Thank you, Mr. President. Our second questioner is Representative Dan Blue of North Carolina, chair of our Assembly on Federal Issues.

Representative Blue.

Representative Dan Blue. Thank you, Madam President. Good morning, Mr. President.

The President. Good morning, Dan.

Representative Blue. Mr. President, you alluded briefly to welfare reform. State legislators have welcomed the current debate on the welfare system. We, like you, believe that

it is in need of substantial reform. However, NCSL believes that any welfare reform legislation must contain some kind of contingency or rainy-day fund to assist States during periods of emergency. And we wonder whether you would share with us your position on this issue.

The President. Well, I clearly agree with you. If we're going to the block grant proposals, there have to be some protections for the times when the economy goes down in the country as a whole, and the times when the economy goes down in some parts of the country but not in others. I have tried to say all along that one of the big risks with these block grants is that some States are going to come up short in the next recession, and all States could.

And one of the things that really concerns me—I'm very excited about the fact that there's a lot of energy here in Washington, and a lot of energy for reform throughout the country. We've got a lot of new people in Government, with a lot of really determined ideas about what to do to change. And even when they disagree with me, I think it's an exciting thing to have this kind of debate. But we must have memory, also, and we must have some way of calling on our common experience.

I am gratified that the productivity of the American private sector and the economic policies that we have established, the kind of work that many of you do in economic development in your own State have given us now a couple of years of nationwide economic growth. But I want to reemphasize, if you go back over the last 20 years in our history, this period is atypical. In most of the last 20 years, we've had some regions doing well while others were doing poorly.

And we need to make sure that we don't have States left holding the bag if their own economies hit a log down the road. Now, I have spoken to State legislators now throughout the country, in Florida and Indiana and other places, and I can tell you that—I mean, Florida and Iowa and other places, excuse me—and I can tell you that I've talked privately with Republicans and Democrats alike, who ask me to fight for protections like the contingency fund, and even the State match. Particularly in the fast-growing States,

they're worried about this. So I will support you on that. I will stand with you on that.

I think that what you need to do here is to make sure when each one of these issues is being debated in Congress that you understand both the up sides and the down sides, because when Congress proposes these kind of block grants they may be in philosophical agreement with you at one level, that you should have more say over your own affairs, but keep in mind also, there's a big desire to meet these very, very tough deficit reduction targets that they have set for themselves. So if they are using you to save money, it only works for you if the increased flexibility and the diminished paperwork and hassle and the increased creativity you can bring to the task means you can do the same work for less money as well or better than you were doing it before. And it only works if these economic changes have been taken into account.

So I'm with you on it. I'll work with you. We can get this done. I will say again, for all of my differences with the Congress, we have got to balance the budget. We are going to do that. We are going to reach an agreement on it. But we need to do it in a way that enables you to do your job and that promotes the objectives of a balanced budget, more jobs, higher incomes, a more stable future for our children.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke by satellite at 11:16 a.m. from room 459 in the Old Executive Office Building to the convention meeting in Milwaukee, WI.

Remarks to Federal Law Enforcement Officials

July 20, 1995

Thank you very much, Eljay. If you want to see which job has more stress, this is the print on his introduction and this is the print on my card. [*Laughter*]

Let me say, first of all, I came here to express my appreciation to all of you for continuing these regular meetings and increasing our ability to do the work of law enforcement by this kind of coordination. I think it is ter-

ribly important, and I thank you for doing it.

Because so many issues involving Federal law enforcement have been in the public's mind in the last several weeks, I would like to say a few things and then just sit here and visit with you and listen to you for a while. Let me begin by saying that we all know that this country still has too much violence, too many drugs, too many gangs, that the culture of violence is still causing enormous difficulty in our country.

There was a profoundly moving story in one of our newspapers today about a 16-year-old boy who just shot a 12-year-old boy dead because he thought he'd been treated with disrespect. And this comes just a few days after a national survey in which two-thirds of young gang members said they thought it was acceptable to shoot a person just because they treated you with disrespect.

This is the environment that we have to change in America today, the paranoia, the division, the willingness to resort to that kind of destructive behavior. And that's why I've been so disturbed about the recent attempts to attack police officers, in general, for doing their jobs. People may disagree with certain laws, like the ban on assault weapons, but that doesn't give them a right to disobey the law. People have no right to assault or kill police officers simply for doing their duty.

Now, I want to talk just a minute about the Waco hearings, and especially what happened yesterday. We know that law enforcement people made mistakes at Waco. Our administration said that in 1993. We had an exhaustive review and when the results came in, we took appropriate action. Changes were made; people were dismissed. That's the way our system is supposed to work in an open and accountable way. Congressional hearings were held in 1993 and in 1994. And if Congress wants to have further hearings today, that is their right, and it is entirely appropriate. We have to hope some more good things will come out, and we can learn how to better do our jobs.

But I think it's important to get the facts here quite clear. Yesterday's testimony was a sad and painful reminder of the depravity that took place inside that compound and the facts which confronted the President, the At-

torney General, and the Federal law enforcement officials at the time. Here was a man who was molesting young girls and paddling children with boat oars, a man who was laying up supplies and illegal weapons for Armageddon, a man who was instructing women and children about how to commit suicide, a man who took the trust of young children and twisted it, who told people that if they wanted to do the will of God they had to be willing to kill for God.

Those are the facts. There is no moral equivalency between the disgusting acts which took place inside that compound in Waco and the efforts that law enforcement officers made to enforce the law and protect the lives of innocent people. There is no moral equivalency. That is the point that has to be hammered home over and over. It is irresponsible for people in elected positions to suggest that the police are some sort of armed bureaucracy acting on private grudges and hidden agendas. That is wrong. It's inaccurate, and people who suggest that ought to be ashamed of themselves.

People in law enforcement make mistakes. There are all kinds of people in law enforcement, just like there are all kinds of people in any endeavor, and all people, the last time I checked, were imperfect. When people make mistakes, they ought to be held accountable and appropriate action ought to be taken.

I said yesterday, I am appalled by what happened at that gathering in Tennessee. We're going to find the facts. We're going to take appropriate action. But that is a very different thing from suggesting that there is some sort of equivalency between what the law enforcement officers tried to do at Waco and the kind of things that were going on in that compound. And this country needs to be able to make that distinction and not to forget it.

In Oklahoma City, after the terrible bombing, Americans were wearing a T-shirt—I've got a copy of it here that was given to me, and I'd never seen this before. But this T-shirt shows all the different things that Federal law enforcement officials do and mentions all the different agencies and has the following quote on it, "A society that makes

war against its police had better learn to make friends with criminals." That's a fact.

We need to be accountable. We need to get all the facts out. If we make a mistake we need to correct it. But we must not make war against police. And we must not confuse making mistakes with the moral equivalency of what decent people are doing to protect the citizens of this country with the awful things that happened in that compound at Waco.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:12 p.m. in the Blair House. In his remarks, he referred to Eljay Bowran, Director, U.S. Secret Service.

Remarks to the American Legion Girls Nation

July 21, 1995

Thank you. Well, good afternoon. I'm delighted to see you all. I'm sorry we're beginning a little late, but I think all of you know that we have been working very hard for the last few days on the crisis in Bosnia. So I'd like to say a few words about that and then make the remarks that I wanted to make to the delegates to Girls Nation.

As you know, there are meetings now going on in London in which the United States is working with our allies to reach a common position which would permit the United Nations mission to continue but would empower the international community to stand up against the outrages that have occurred in the last few days.

We're all concerned about those events, and we welcome the statement by Foreign Secretary Rifkind that an attack by the Bosnian Serbs on the United Nations safe area of Gorazde will be met by a substantial and decisive response. For the United States, the most important word is "decisive."

The conference has also agreed that the U.N. mission should be strengthened and that access to the city of Sarajevo should be ensured by the rapid reaction force that the British and French and others are attempting to establish and that we have strongly supported. There is more work to be done, and the United States is determined to do everything that we can, not only to deal with the

problems of Gorazde and Sarajevo but also to find a peaceful end to this war.

The meetings so far, from my point of view, are proceeding well. There seems to be a real sense of resolve to come together in common purpose, and I am encouraged. We will have more reports later.

Now, let me welcome all of you here. As all you know, I hope—or some of you doubtless know, I was here as a delegate to Boys Nation on this month 32 years ago. This is a very different time but a very challenging time for our country. And I'd like to make, if I might, just a few observations about the world that will be your future.

At the end of the cold war and the dawn of the next century, our country is in so many ways better positioned for the future than any other country in the world. And I believe that the chances are very strong that the young people of America will have, by far, the most exciting lives, the most full of possibility, and the most free of the fear of war and destruction, of any generation of Americans ever.

But this is a difficult time as well. And let me just sort of put out the two sides of the coin. If you look at it, the positive side is our economy is strong. We have seen 7 million new jobs in the last 2½ years, very low inflation, low unemployment. The stock market's at an all-time high. Business profits are high. The last 2 years in America, in each year we have had the largest number of new businesses formed of any year in our history and a record number of Americans becoming millionaires, through their own efforts—through their own efforts—succeeding in our system. In almost every major area of our country where the crime rate has been high, there has been a substantial drop in the crime rate. That is the good news.

On the other hand, it is also true that in spite of all this economic good news, more than half the American people are working harder today for the same or lower incomes they were making 2½ years ago, so that this opportunity is only coming to part of our people. It is also true that even though the crime rate is down overall in the United States and in many of our major cities, young people are still subject to extraordinary rates of violence and crime, that drug usage is still way

too high, and that an increasingly high percentage of our children are born into poverty in a welfare culture.

So the question for you is: How are we going to solve the problems and keep the opportunities? What kind of country do you want to live in? If you look beyond our borders, it's the same thing. The United States now is living in a world where we and the Russians are dismantling our nuclear weapons, where—you know, when I was your age we were still worrying about whether we had nuclear fallout shelters in case there was a bomb dropped. We don't have to worry about that now.

We're seeing peace progress being made everywhere from South Africa to Northern Ireland to the Middle East, democracy restored in Haiti, a lot of good things going on. But what you see in Bosnia and what you see in Rwanda and Burundi is an example of the continuing power of division, division by race, by religion, by ethnic group, to tear people apart and destroy lives.

What you saw in Oklahoma City, what we see when a bus of children or innocent tourists is blown up in the Middle East, what you saw in the subway in Japan where sarin gas was released and killed people is the new threat to our security from terrorism. And the freer and the more open the world gets, the more vulnerable free people everywhere will be to the organized forces of destruction. So the question is how to reap the benefits of freedom and the end of the cold war and openness and still fight the organized forces of destruction.

My vision for this country is that in the 21st century, in your great lifetimes, we will be a high-opportunity society; a high-growth, high-wage, smart-work society, making real progress on our social problems; that people will be empowered to make the most of their own lives and the most of their God-given abilities; and communities and families will have the ability to solve their own problems. That is the kind of America that I want to see, in a world where peace and freedom and progress are always moving in the right direction.

There will never be an end to problems as long as we're on this Earth, but we need to be going in the right direction and taking

advantage of these opportunities. And I am convinced that in our country at this time, when we're changing so much, there is sort of a commonsense consensus about what we ought to do that has been damaged by excessive partisanship and excessive reliance on harsh rhetoric and extreme positions to divide the American people for the political advantage of those who seek to reap it.

And in a time like this of really profound change, we all have to try to imagine the future we want and then ask how are we going to get there and what do we have to do to pull together to get there. That's essentially what we're trying to do here.

So that, for example, I find myself—I agree with the Republican majority in Congress that we ought to balance the budget. We can't afford to have a permanent deficit. But I disagree that we ought to do it in ways that will imperil the Medicare system, undermine our ability to guarantee all the young people in this country the right to go to college and get the education that they need or undermine our ability to protect our environment and our natural heritage and our future. So we have to get through those disagreements.

The main thing I want you to know is that this is an exciting time. On balance, it's a good time. I believe that your adult years will be lived out in America's best period in history if, but only if, we find a way to live together and work together and bridge our divisions and focus on the challenges before us.

And that really will be the great issue of your time. We're going to change regardless. The question is, what kind of change will it be. And are we going to see a country like ours, which is so diverse—well over 150 different racial and ethnic and religious groups in the United States—are we going to see that country come together and take advantage of that, or are we going to suffer from some of the same problems we've seen paralyzing the rest of the world and leading to the deaths of innocent people?

On balance, I am quite optimistic. But this is a very serious time for the United States and a very important time for you to be here. So I hope you will keep that in the back of

your mind as you spend all this time here and then when you go back home next year.

Welcome, and God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:21 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Secretary of State for Defense Malcolm Rifkind of the United Kingdom.

Statement on Budget Rescission Legislation

July 21, 1995

The rescission bill that the Senate approved, and that I will be pleased to sign, shows how we can work together to produce good legislation.

From the start of this rescission process, I agreed with Congress on the need to cut spending. The question was, how should we do it?

I vetoed the original rescission bill because it would have cut spending the wrong way, by targeting education and training, environmental protection, and other key national priorities. I then worked with Republicans and Democrats alike to produce a better bill. I am pleased that this bill cuts \$16 billion in spending while protecting our key investments in education and training, the environment, and other priorities.

Like the earlier version, this bill also provides much-needed supplemental funds that I have sought for disaster relief activities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Federal responses to the bombing in Oklahoma City, increased antiterrorism efforts, and debt relief to Jordan to facilitate progress toward a Middle East peace settlement.

To be sure, I do not support every provision of this bill. For instance, I still do not believe that this bill should contain any of the provisions relating to timber. But the final bill does contain changes in the language that preserve our ability to implement the current forest plans and their standards, and to protect other resources such as clean water and fisheries. Therefore, after signing the rescission bill into law, I will direct the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and all other Federal agencies to

carry out timber salvage activities consistent with the spirit and intent of our forest plans and all existing environmental laws.

I am pleased that bipartisan leaders of Congress worked with me to produce a good bill. Working together, we can continue to produce good legislation for the American people.

Proclamation 6811—Parents' Day, 1995

July 21, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Parenthood is among the most difficult and most rewarding responsibilities in life. Balancing countless demands, parents must be firm yet loving, protective yet liberating. They are the nurturers of our dreams and the soothers of our fears. They instill in their children, by word and example, the importance of family and community involvement, the value of education and hard work.

Parenting is a serious responsibility. All parents have an obligation to provide for the children they bring into the world. Parents must teach and sustain, helping to empower each new generation to meet the challenges and opportunities of life with confidence.

Today, across our country, parents give their time and energy to ensure a better future for their children. Teaching the lessons of honesty and caring in a way that no school or government can, America's parents pass on the spirit, values, and traditions that have made our Nation strong for more than two centuries. Whether stepparents or foster parents, biological or adoptive, parents provide the security, stability, and love that enable children to grow up healthy, happy, and strong.

Parents' Day is a welcome opportunity to celebrate the special and powerful bond between parent and child. On this occasion, let us remember and pay respect to those who give us the daily support and loving guidance that lead us to become responsible and contributing citizens.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,
President of the United States of America,

in accordance with Public Law 103-362, do hereby proclaim Sunday, July 23, 1995, as "Parents' Day." I invite the States, communities, and the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities expressing gratitude and abiding affection for parents.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-first day of July, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twentieth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:49 p.m., July 24, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on July 26.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

July 18

In the morning, the President met with senior foreign policy advisers to discuss the situation in Bosnia and with Members of Congress to discuss affirmative action.

In the evening, the President met with David Daliberti, an American who had been imprisoned in Iraq after crossing the Iraqi border on March 13. He and Hillary Clinton then hosted a picnic for members of the press on the South Lawn.

The President announced his intention to nominate John A. Knubel to be Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The President announced his intention to appoint William F. McSweeney to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Smithsonian Institution.

July 19

In the morning, the President had telephone conversations with President Jacques Chirac of France and Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom.

In the afternoon, the President met with Members of Congress to discuss the situation in Bosnia.

The President announced his intention to appoint Harriett M. Wieder to the Council of the Administrative Conference of the United States.

The President announced his intention to appoint Steven M. Eidelman; John F. Kennedy, Jr.; Barbara Yoshioka Wheeler; and Sheryl White-Scott to the President's Committee on Mental Retardation.

July 20

The White House announced that the President will attend World War II 50th anniversary commemorations in Honolulu, HI, on September 1-3.

The President announced his intention to reappoint Barry M. Goldwater to the U.S. Air Force Academy Board of Visitors.

July 21

The President announced his intention to nominate James A. Joseph as Ambassador to South Africa.

The President announced his intention to nominate Hal C. DeCell III to be Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The President announced his intention to nominate Paul M. Homan as Special Trustee for American Indians at the Department of the Interior.

The White House announced that the President made available \$100 million in emergency home energy assistance to States that have experienced extremely hot weather.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations

to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted July 17

Eileen B. Claussen,
of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, vice Elinor G. Constable.

Greta Joy Dicus,
of Arkansas, to be a member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1998, vice James R. Curtiss, term expired.

Lee F. Jackson,
of Massachusetts, to be U.S. Director of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, vice James H. Scheuer, resigned.

Eluid Levi Martinez,
of New Mexico, to be Commissioner of Reclamation, vice Daniel P. Beard, resigned.

Ernest J. Moniz,
of Massachusetts, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, vice Mary Rita Cooke Greenwood, resigned.

Donald S. Wasserman,
of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of 5 years expiring July 1, 2000, vice Pamela Talkin, term expired.

Harris Wofford,
of Pennsylvania, to be Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service, vice Eli J. Segal.

Withdrawn July 17

Robert M. Sussman,
of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for a term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1998, vice James R. Curtiss, term expired, which was sent to the Senate on January 5, 1995.

Submitted July 19

Thomas R. Bloom,
of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of Education, vice James Bert Thomas, Jr., resigned.

Jill L. Long,
of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, vice Bob J. Nash, resigned

Sidney R. Thomas,
of Montana, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, vice Dorothy Wright Nelson, retired.

Submitted July 20

James A. Joseph,
of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa.

Submitted July 21

John H. Bingler, Jr.,
of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, vice Maurice B. Cohill, Jr., retired.

**Checklist
of White House Press Releases**

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released July 17

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Announcement of the President's request for additional funds for antiterrorism initiatives

Announcement of transmittal of budget amendments for the Department of Defense, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Social Security Administration

Released July 18

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Special Associate Counsel to the President Mark Fabiani on the Senate Whitewater hearings

Announcement of nominations for Chief Executive Officer and a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service

Announcement of nomination for U.S. Director of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development

Announcement of nomination for Inspector General of the Department of Education

Released July 19

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Senior Adviser for Policy and Strategy George Stephanopoulos and Special Counsel to the President Chris Edley on affirmative action

Announcement of nomination for U.S. Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit

Released July 20

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the President will attend World War II 50th anniversary commemorations in Honolulu, HI, on September 1–3

Transcript of remarks by National Security Adviser Anthony Lake to the National League of POW/MIA Families

Announcement of nomination for Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs

Released July 21

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Announcement of White House tours for Korean war veterans and their families

Announcement of nomination for U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania

**Acts Approved
by the President**

NOTE: No acts approved by the President were received by the Office of the Federal Register during the period covered by this issue.